

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY





Cornell University
Library

The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924029186430>

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF INDIA

EDITED BY

J. N. FARQUHAR, M.A., D.Litt.

LITERARY SECRETARY, NATIONAL COUNCIL, YOUNG MEN'S
CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATIONS, INDIA AND CEYLON ;

AND

NICOL MACNICOL, M.A., D.Litt.

ALREADY PUBLISHED

THE VILLAGE GODS OF SOUTH INDIA. By the BISHOP
OF MADRAS.

VOLUMES UNDER PREPARATION

THE VAISHŅAVISM OF PANDHARPUR. By NICOL MACNICOL,
M.A., D.Litt., Poona.

THE CHAITANYAS. By M. T. KENNEDY, M.A., Calcutta.

THE ŚRĪ-VAISHŅAVAS. By E. C. WORMAN, M.A., Madras.

THE ŚAIVA SIDDHĀNTA. By G. E. PHILLIPS, M.A., and
FRANCIS KINGSBURY, Bangalore.

THE VĪRA ŚAIVAS. By the REV. W. E. TOMLINSON, Gubbi,
Mysore.

THE BRĀHMA MOVEMENT. By MANILAL C. PAREKH, B.A.,
Rajkot, Kathiawar.

THE RĀMAKRISHNA MOVEMENT. By I. N. C. GANGULY,
B.A., Calcutta.

THE ṢŪFĪS. By R. SIRAJ-UD-DIN, B.A., and H. A. WALTER,
M.A., Lahore.

THE KHOJAS. By W. M. HUME, B.A., Lahore.

THE MĀLAS AND MĀDIGĀS. By the BISHOP OF DORNAKAL
and P. B. EMMETT, B.A., Kurnool.

THE CHAMĀRS. By G. W. BRIGGS, B.A., Allahabad.

THE DHEDS. By MRS. SINCLAIR STEVENSON, M.A., D.Sc.,
Rajkot, Kathiawar.

THE MAHĀRS. By A. ROBERTSON, M.A., Poona.

THE BHILS. By D. LEWIS, Jhalod, Panch Mahals.

THE CRIMINAL TRIBES. By O. H. B. STARTE, I.C.S.,
Bijapur.

EDITORIAL PREFACE

THE purpose of this series of small volumes on the leading forms which religious life has taken in India is to produce really reliable information for the use of all who are seeking the welfare of India. Editor and writers alike desire to work in the spirit of the best modern science, looking only for the truth. But, while doing so and seeking to bring to the interpretation of the systems under review such imagination and sympathy as characterise the best study in the domain of religion to-day, they believe they are able to shed on their work fresh light drawn from the close religious intercourse which they have each had with the people who live by the faith herein described ; and their study of the relevant literature has in every instance been largely supplemented by persistent questioning of those likely to be able to give information. In each case the religion described is brought into relation with Christianity. It is believed that all readers in India at least will recognize the value of this practical method of bringing out the salient features of Indian religious life.





HAZRAT MIRZA BASHIR-UD-DIN MAHMUD AHMAD
KHALIFA-UL-MASIH.

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE OF INDIA

THE

AHMADIYA MOVEMENT

BY

H. A. WALTER, M.A.

MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY ; LITERARY SECRETARY,
NATIONAL COUNCIL, YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN
ASSOCIATIONS OF INDIA AND CEYLON

ASSOCIATION PRESS
5 RUSSELL STREET, CALCUTTA

HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, MELBOURNE
BOMBAY AND MADRAS

1918

TO
MY MOTHER AND FATHER
WHOSE LOVING SACRIFICE HAS ENTERED
INTO THE MAKING OF THIS BOOK.

PREFACE

MY primary purpose in undertaking this study of one of the most significant and (outside of India) little-known of modern movements among Muslims was not that of answering from the Christian viewpoint the claim of Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad to be the “promised Messiah” who has come “in the spirit and power” of Jesus Christ. This has been done already in the pamphlets of Dr. H. D. Griswold and Rev. Thakur Dass, mentioned in the bibliography at the close. My first aim has been rather to sketch the history and tenets of the Aḥmadiya movement, for the most part as its founder and his disciples have themselves conceived it, and to do it as far as I could in their own language. I have found this to be largely possible, since a survey of the literature of the movement in Arabic and Urdu, made with the help of my friend, Maulvī S. T. Ghaus, has convinced me that nearly everything of essential importance in the development of the cult, from the Aḥmadiya viewpoint, is to be found in its English publications, chiefly in *The Review of Religions*, of which I have read nearly every issue from the beginning. In the footnotes I have explained, for the benefit of the reader not familiar with the orthodox Muslim faith, such words and ideas as are peculiar to Islām, and also allusions to events and personalities pertaining to India or the Muḥammadan world in general. The connection of the Aḥmadiya movement with the English mission of Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn, a connection not now emphasized by the latter, has been

indicated in the sixth chapter because of the special interest which this may have for students of Islām in the West. In the last chapter I have endeavoured briefly to set forth the permanent place and significance of the movement in its relation to the general development in India of Muslim thought and life. I have made no attempt to deal at length with the puzzling subject of Muslim eschatology, in whose mazes Mīrẓā Ghulām Aḥmad, like so many other self-designated Maḥdis, wandered undismayed. I have here, as elsewhere, endeavoured to introduce only so much of the background of the orthodox faith as seemed necessary to an adequate understanding of the subject of this study.

With regard to the transliteration into English of Urdu and Arabic words, I have, to avoid confusion, taken the liberty in most instances of introducing the uniform system, which I have sought to follow, into the many English quotations from Aḥmadiya writings, when there was originally little attempt at accurate transliteration.

I desire to mention the generous assistance of several friends who contributed variously and essentially to the writing and publishing of this book. I refer to Dr. H. D. Griswold, Secretary of the Council of American Presbyterian Missions in India, at whose original suggestion it was undertaken and without the loan of whose extensive library of Aḥmadiya literature it could scarcely have been carried out; to Mr. Abdul Rahīm, of the editorial department of the Aḥmadiya community, who was my friendly host on the occasion of a visit to Qādiān and has been my most constant and reliable informant in matters relating to present conditions within the movement; to Professor D. B. Macdonald, of the Hartford Theological Seminary, who has rendered invaluable assistance, especially

in connection with the references to Muslim eschatology; to Professor Sirāj-ud-Dīn, of Lahore, to whom I am indebted for many useful suggestions; and to my brother-in-law, Rev. William Brower Johnson, and my colleagues in the Young Men's Christian Association in India, Messrs. Frank Speer Coan, W. M. Hume, and F. de L. Hyde, for helping forward in various ways the preparation of the manuscript for the press.

Lahore,
Oct. 10th, 1918.

H. A. W.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD	13
II.	THE DISTINCTIVE CLAIMS OF AHMAD	25
III.	THE AHMADIYA MOVEMENT AND ORTHODOX ISLAM..	53
IV.	THE AHMADIYA MOVEMENT AND CHRISTIANITY ..	75
V.	THE AHMADIYA MOVEMENT AND THE INDIGENOUS RELIGIONS OF INDIA	101
VI.	THE AHMADIYA COMMUNITY	111
VII.	THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AHMADIYA MOVEMENT..	131
	AHMADIYA BIBLIOGRAPHY	141
	APPENDIX I	142
	,, II	145
	,, III	146
	,, IV	151
	,, V	153
	,, VI	155
	,, VII	160
	INDEX	163

ERRATA

While this book was passing through the press the author died suddenly of influenza. As a consequence the book has not received the final revision in proof that it would have had from the author himself, and it is feared that a number of misprints, especially in transliterated words, have escaped detection.

For example, the word *Mahdī* appears wrongly on pages 8, 16, 21, 25, 37, 38, 39, 48, 51, 71, 72, 73, 111, 119, 132, 138 and 147 as *Maḥḍi*.

Also on page 13 for p. 171 (end of Note 1), read p. 222.

- „ „ 24 for VII, p. 7 (end of Note 2), read VII, p. 241.
- „ „ 41 for “ Qderaculous Ode,” read “ Miraculous Ode.”
- „ „ 41 for *Review of Religions* I, p. 79, read I, p. 80.
- „ „ 41 for Shārik (Note 7), read Sharik.
- „ „ 48 for *Review of Religions* V, p. 363, read V, p. 365.
- „ „ 55 for Mulhām, read Mulham.
- „ „ 93 for Yesu (Note 2), read Yisū.
- „ „ 97 for *Review of Religions* IV, pp. 34-435, read pp. 434-435.
- „ „ 104 for p. 69, Note 2 (Note 1), read p. 82, Note 3.
- „ „ 120 for *Review of Religions* IV, p. 224, read XV, p. 224.
- „ „ 123 for p. 104, Note 1 (Note 2), read p. 107, Note 2.
- „ „ 134 for Tahzih-'ul-Akhlaq, read Tahzib-'ul-Akhlaq.
- „ „ 136 for p. 103 (Note 3), read p. 133.
- „ „ 153 for Sheikh Rahmahillah, read Sheikh Rahmatullah.
- „ „ Table of Contents, Chapter IV, for p. 75, read 77.

THE EDITORS.

E 1'

193

A5223

TO
MY MOTHER AND FATHER
WHOSE LOVING SACRIFICE HAS ENTERED
INTO THE MAKING OF THIS BOOK.

PREFACE

MY primary purpose in undertaking this study of one of the most significant and (outside of India) little-known of modern movements among Muslims was not that of answering from the Christian viewpoint the claim of Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad to be the “promised Messiah” who has come “in the spirit and power” of Jesus Christ. This has been done already in the pamphlets of Dr. H. D. Griswold and Rev. Thakur Dass, mentioned in the bibliography at the close. My first aim has been rather to sketch the history and tenets of the Aḥmadiya movement, for the most part as its founder and his disciples have themselves conceived it, and to do it as far as I could in their own language. I have found this to be largely possible, since a survey of the literature of the movement in Arabic and Urdu, made with the help of my friend, Maulvī S. T. Ghaus, has convinced me that nearly everything of essential importance in the development of the cult, from the Aḥmadiya viewpoint, is to be found in its English publications, chiefly in *The Review of Religions*, of which I have read nearly every issue from the beginning. In the footnotes I have explained, for the benefit of the reader not familiar with the orthodox Muslim faith, such words and ideas as are peculiar to Islām, and also allusions to events and personalities pertaining to India or the Muḥammadan world in general. The connection of the Aḥmadiya movement with the English mission of Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn, a connection not now emphasized by the latter, has been

indicated in the sixth chapter because of the special interest which this may have for students of Islām in the West. In the last chapter I have endeavoured briefly to set forth the permanent place and significance of the movement in its relation to the general development in India of Muslim thought and life. I have made no attempt to deal at length with the puzzling subject of Muslim eschatology, in whose mazes Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad, like so many other self-designated Maḥdis, wandered undismayed. I have here, as elsewhere, endeavoured to introduce only so much of the background of the orthodox faith as seemed necessary to an adequate understanding of the subject of this study.

With regard to the transliteration into English of Urdu and Arabic words, I have, to avoid confusion, taken the liberty in most instances of introducing the uniform system, which I have sought to follow, into the many English quotations from Aḥmadiya writings, when there was originally little attempt at accurate transliteration.

I desire to mention the generous assistance of several friends who contributed variously and essentially to the writing and publishing of this book. I refer to Dr. H. D. Griswold, Secretary of the Council of American Presbyterian Missions in India, at whose original suggestion it was undertaken and without the loan of whose extensive library of Aḥmadiya literature it could scarcely have been carried out; to Mr. Abdul Rahīm, of the editorial department of the Aḥmadiya community, who was my friendly host on the occasion of a visit to Qādiān and has been my most constant and reliable informant in matters relating to present conditions within the movement; to Professor D. B. Macdonald, of the Hartford Theological Seminary, who has rendered invaluable assistance, especially

in connection with the references to Muslim eschatology ; to Professor Sirāj-ud-Dīn, of Lahore, to whom I am indebted for many useful suggestions ; and to my brother-in-law, Rev. William Brower Johnson, and my colleagues in the Young Men's Christian Association in India, Messrs. Frank Speer Coan, W. M. Hume, and F. de L. Hyde, for helping forward in various ways the preparation of the manuscript for the press.

Lahore,
Oct. 10th, 1918.

H. A. W.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD	13
II.	THE DISTINCTIVE CLAIMS OF AHMAD	25
III.	THE AHMADIYA MOVEMENT AND ORTHODOX ISLAM..	53
IV.	THE AHMADIYA MOVEMENT AND CHRISTIANITY ..	75
V.	THE AHMADIYA MOVEMENT AND THE INDIGENOUS RELIGIONS OF INDIA	101
VI.	THE AHMADIYA COMMUNITY	111
VII.	THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AHMADIYA MOVEMENT..	131
	AHMADIYA BIBLIOGRAPHY	141
	APPENDIX I	142
	,, II	145
	,, III	146
	,, IV	151
	,, V	153
	,, VI	155
	,, VII	160
	INDEX	163

ERRATA

While this book was passing through the press the author died suddenly of influenza. As a consequence the book has not received the final revision in proof that it would have had from the author himself, and it is feared that a number of misprints, especially in transliterated words, have escaped detection.

For example, the word *Mahdī* appears wrongly on pages 8, 16, 21, 25, 37, 38, 39, 48, 51, 71, 72, 73, 111, 119, 132, 138 and 147 as *Mahdi*.

- Also on page 13 for p. 171 (end of Note 1), read p. 222.
- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| „ | „ | 24 for VII, p. 7 (end of Note 2), read VII, p. 241. |
| „ | „ | 41 for “ Qderaculous Ode,” read “ Miraculous Ode.” |
| „ | „ | 41 for <i>Review of Religions</i> I, p. 79, read I, p. 80. |
| „ | „ | 41 for Shārik (Note 7), read Sharik. |
| „ | „ | 48 for <i>Review of Religions</i> V, p. 363, read V, p. 365. |
| „ | „ | 55 for Mulhām, read Mulham. |
| „ | „ | 93 for Yesu (Note 2), read Yisū. |
| „ | „ | 97 for <i>Review of Religions</i> IV, pp. 34-435, read pp. 434-435. |
| „ | „ | 104 for p. 69, Note 2 (Note 1), read p. 82, Note 3. |
| „ | „ | 120 for <i>Review of Religions</i> IV, p. 224, read XV, p. 224. |
| „ | „ | 123 for p. 104, Note 1 (Note 2), read p. 107, Note 2. |
| „ | „ | 134 for Tahzih-'ul-Akhlaq, read Tahzib-'ul-Akhlaq. |
| „ | „ | 136 for p. 103 (Note 3), read p. 133. |
| „ | „ | 153 for Sheikh Rahmahillah, read Sheikh Rahmatullah. |
| „ | „ | Table of Contents, Chapter IV, for p. 75, read 77. |

THE EDITORS.

CHAPTER I

MĪRZĀ GHULĀM AḤMAD¹

MIRZA GHULAM AHMAD KHAN was born in the village of Qādiān, Gurdāspur District, Panjab, on the eighteenth of June, 1839,² the year marked by the death of Ranjit Singh, the great Sikh ruler and warrior. He boasted of a good Mughal ancestry, and hence bore the title, "Mīrzā," which is used to designate one who belongs to the Mughal race. His family emigrated from Central Asia to India in the sixteenth century, in the reign of Bābar, and settled in the Panjab, where they were granted a large tract of land, about seventy miles from Lahore. The capital of this little State was known as Islāmpūr, and is the modern Qādiān. The family suffered persecution and expulsion in the early days of Sikh rule, but under Ranjit Singh the father of Ghulām Aḥmad, Mīrzā Ghulām Murtabā, received back a portion of the property which had belonged to the family and returned to Qādiān. Under the British Government, which succeeded to that of the Sikhs, Mīrzā Ghulām Murtabā set an example of loyalty to British rule, in the days of the great mutiny of 1857, to which his son has often referred with justifiable

¹ The sources from which the facts regarding Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad's life have been culled are conversations with his followers and with Christian missionaries and others who were personally acquainted with him, a brief biography in Urdu by Mi'rāj-ud-Dīn, prefixed to the first edition of the *Barākin-i-Aḥmadīya*, a recent biography in Urdu, of which all the parts have not yet appeared, by Mīrzā Yakūb Beg (Qādiān, 1916), and a memorial article in *The Review of Religions* for June, 1908 (p. 171).

² Recent references to the date of Aḥmad's birth place it vaguely "some time in 1836 or 1837" (*Review of Religions*, XV, p. 26), but the date given here is the one generally accepted by his biographers.

pride. The father was by profession a native physician of some learning, and desired that his son, who early showed an aptitude for study, should be well educated in accordance with the ideas and standards of the time. From his sixth to his tenth year he studied with a Persian tutor. From that time until he was seventeen an Arabic scholar and holy man was his instructor, and under his tuition he laid the foundation of that exceptional facility of expression in the Arabic language which was to serve him so well in later years. Some time after his seventeenth year his father secured for the studious, visionary lad employment in Government service, in a subordinate capacity, in the office of the Deputy Commissioner at Sialkot; but a few years of this service sufficed to convince Mirzā Ghulām Murtabā that his son possessed no aptitude for business. He then endeavoured to induce him to study law, with a view to his becoming a pleader, but this the lad resolutely refused to do.

One fruit of his residence in Sialkot was an acquaintance which it yielded with some missionaries of the Church of Scotland, residing there, with whom he spent many hours in religious discussion. The importance for future Aḥmadiya doctrine of this contact with Christian missionaries, during the formative years of Aḥmad's life, it would be difficult to exaggerate.

After four years of this service he resigned and returned to Qādiān, where he was desired by his father to assist the family in connection with the law-suits arising out of the estate. There also his entire lack of business acumen soon became evident. Some time before his father's death, in 1876, the efforts of the latter to assure to the young man some measure of worldly advancement had ceased, and he was left to his own devices. After his father died the slight constraint which the parental ambition may have exerted was removed, and Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad lived quietly at Qādiān, studying the Qur'ān, the traditions and the commentators, and making himself somewhat familiar with the tenets of the different religions of the world. His hatred of the world grew upon him, and various eccentricities developed. His friendly bio-

grapher, Mi'rāj-ud-Dīn, writing after his death, in 1908, tells of some of his personal peculiarities, developed in those early years of obscurity, such as his habit of eating bits of earth and his abnormal fondness for sweets. As he walked the streets, with his thoughts in the heavens and his pockets filled with sweets, the urchins of the street, aware of his weakness, would abstract the sweets and make off with them, while the erstwhile owner proceeded innocently on his way. In one instance mischievous youths stuffed a brick into the pocket where the sweets had been, and its presence was not discovered until the Mīrzā Ṣāhib lay down to sleep at night. At another time, writes a more recent biographer, Mīrzā Yakūb Beg, he neglected to remove one of his shoes at night and slept unconscious of the fact until the morning, when, after a long search, he accidentally discovered it. On another occasion his clothes caught fire, and the fire was extinguished by a friend, while he himself remained oblivious of the danger. A story, which is told to illustrate both his detachment from worldly affairs and his recognition of the working of Divine Providence in all things, relates how on one occasion his little son, aged four (the present "*Khalīfa*," Bashīr-ud-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad), came into his room and burned all of his father's writings which he could discover. The Mīrzā Ṣāhib paid no attention to what was happening, and when informed of it merely remarked, "There is some benefit from God in this." When told that a poor woman had stolen some rice from his kitchen, he is said to have replied, "Let us say nothing about it, but give her some more if she is in need of it." All his life he suffered from diabetes (polyuria) and vertigo. From his youth he had strange visions and dreams, which he interpreted himself, and in which he always figured in some pre-eminent capacity.

Meantime he was exercising and developing his ability as a writer of excellent Persian, Arabic and Urdu. In 1880 appeared the first two parts of his most celebrated work, the *Barāhin-i-Aḥmadiya* (Aḥmadiya Proofs), and although in the exposition of Muslim doctrines contained therein there was already present the germ of the unique Aḥmadiya

teachings, which formed the basis of his later quarrels with orthodox Muslims, this book was quite universally acclaimed (in so far as it was read), throughout the Muhammadan world, as a work of power and originality.

The turning point in the career of the Mīrẓā Ṣāḥib and the real beginning of the independent existence of the Aḥmadiya movement occurred on the 4th of March, 1889, when he announced a divine revelation giving him the right to accept *bai'āt* (i.e., homage paid to a king or to a religious leader) from a disciple. There then came into existence a little group of individuals who accepted his guidance in all matters pertaining to the spiritual life. It was not until 1891, however, that Aḥmad made the declaration which caused a sharp line of demarcation to be drawn between himself and the larger world of Islām. He then announced that he was both the promised Messiah and the Maḥdi expected by Muslims, and sought to make clear his position in three books:—*Fateh Islām*, *Tanzīh-i-Marām* and *Izāla-i-Auhām*. From that time forward his life was involved in bitter controversy with orthodox Muḥammadans, Ārya Samāj leaders and Christians. Through the activity of one of his most persistent enemies, Maulvī Muḥammad Husain, formerly his friend and co-worker, a *fatwā* (legal pronouncement by a Muslim authority on canon law)¹ was secured, bearing the confirmatory seals of many important mullahs throughout India, excommunicating Aḥmad and his followers from Islām on account of heresy, and declaring that their destruction was thenceforth sanctioned in accordance with orthodox law.² On his part, the Mīrẓā Ṣāḥib now became very active and vocal in his denunciation of his enemies. Again and again he was haled into court—particularly in connection with his various prophecies of death or disgrace to be visited upon particular foes. In some cases, as will appear hereafter,³ these were so literally fulfilled as to cause strong suspicion that steps had been taken by Aḥmad's followers, with or without his cognizance, to see that the prophecy should not fail of fulfilment.

¹ Cf. p. 69, Note 1. ² Cf. p. 74, Note 1. ³ Cf. p. 43.

A memorable hour in Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad's life occurred in December, 1896, when he read a paper at the Conference of Religions in Lahore, entitled "The Sources of Divine Knowledge,"¹ which gives an extensive summary of the Aḥmadiya interpretation of the Qur'ān and the Islāmic theory of salvation.

From the year 1892, in addition to several vernacular periodicals, an English monthly magazine, *The Review of Religions*, was published by the sect in Qādiān, whence it still issues. One of the cleverest of Aḥmad's followers, Maulvī Muḥammad 'Alī, M.A., LL.B., was called to the editorship of this periodical, and at one time he was assisted by Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn, of whom we shall have more to say further on.² This paper was well named, for it has given its attention to a remarkably wide range of religions and to a great variety of subjects. Orthodox Hinduism, the Ārya Samāj, the Brahma Samāj and Theosophy; Sikhism, Buddhism, Jainism and Zoroastrianism; Bahā'ism, Christian Science and Christianity have all received attention, as well as Islām in all its ramifications, both ancient and modern, such as the Shī'ites, Ahl-i-Hadīs,³ Kharijites,⁴ Šūfis and such representative exponents of modern tendencies as Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān⁵ and Syed Amīr 'Alī.⁶ In another chapter we shall deal with the Aḥmadiya attitude toward Christianity. We would only pause here to comment on the alertness and diligence of the group of Aḥmadiya leaders who have kept the rank and file of the movement informed of the currents of thought and life in present-day Christianity. *The Review of Religions* refers, for example, to Mormonism and Zionism, and to Professor George B. Foster's book, *The Finality of the Christian Religion* (Chicago, 1906), which

¹ Later published, with the title, *The Teachings of Islām*, by Luzac & Co., London, 1910.

² Cf. p. 113ff.

³ Literally, "People of Tradition," a name used in India by the puritanical sect of Wāhhābites, and in particular referring to a group of about forty thousand of these Muslim purists in the Panjab.

⁴ The adherents of this sect of Muslims, neither Sunnis nor Shī'ites, respect the first three *Khalīfas* but reject and abuse 'Alī.

⁵ Cf. p. 66, Note 1.

⁶ Cf. p. 65, Note 3.

involved him in a heresy trial in America; to R. J. Campbell's *New Theology*, and the Keswick movement in England; to the Johannine sect in Russia, the great revival in Wales and the World's Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in 1910; to the modern critical school of theologians in Germany, to Modernism in the Roman Catholic Church in Italy, and to Christian missionary activity in Palestine, Japan, Iceland, South Africa, Egypt and other lands. Books by Western students of Islām such as Pfander, Hughes, Margoliouth, Zwemer, Gairdner, Snouck Hurgronje, Noldeke, E. G. Brown and Canon Sell receive due attention. The new Leyden *Encyclopedia of Islām* is heartily commended. There are frequent quotations from the *Encyclopediu Britannica*, the *Encyclopedia Biblica* and the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, and from such periodicals as *The London Quarterly Review*, *The Contemporary Review*, *The Review of Reviews*, *The Westminster Review*, *The Hibbert Journal*, *The Biblical World*, *The East and the West*, *The Moslem World*, and others too numerous to mention, including, of course, all of the important Christian missionary periodicals in India. It must be said, however, that the comments on the scattered quotations show a woful lack of balanced judgment and of any broad and fixed principles of scholarly criticism.

That Aḥmad himself, like his most intelligent followers, kept abreast of the times to a considerable extent, and possessed at least a superficial knowledge of conditions in the religious world, his own articles and addresses give ample evidence. The pity was, and is, that with his learning and his cleverness in controversy there was not associated an honest and discriminating judgment, a passion for truth stretching beyond the sole confines of the Islām of his conception, and an irenic spirit which could disagree and dispute with others without becoming angrily uncharitable and unfair. Because of these weaknesses he cannot be considered seriously as a scholar in any field.

It is difficult for one who knows Aḥmad only through his writings to appraise his character. That he was

a man of simple habits and generous impulses all the evidence at our disposal would indicate. His courage in the face of bitter persecution, amounting to attempts at physical violence, is certainly commendable. Only a man of magnetic and pleasing personality could have attracted and held the friendship and loyalty of such numbers of men, of whom two, at least, died for their faith, in Afghanistan, in accordance with orthodox Musalmān law.¹ Those older Aḥmadīs whom I have questioned as to their reasons for joining the movement, have most of them laid greater stress on the personal impression made upon them by the Mīrzā Ṣāhib's forceful and winning personality than on the nature of his peculiar teachings. The real puzzle emerges in the case of Aḥmad, as also of his great master, Muḥammad, when we come to judge of his alleged revelations, particularly those relating to himself and his claims. We shall deal with these in detail in the next chapter. Here we are only interested in them as far as they relate to his character. Some have believed that one who could sincerely make such stupendous claims must have been mentally affected. On one occasion an Indian Christian teacher, named Daniel, visited Aḥmad at Qādiān, and left with him seven questions of which the first three, relating to the mental state of Aḥmad, were as follows :

"1. Have you ever been affected with a brain disease? If so, what and when? Does its attack recur now?

"2. Did you begin to have revelations before you suffered from an attack of such disease or after that? Have any of your relations ever made strange pretensions? If so, what and when?

"3. Has the idea ever had access to your mind that your claims may be wrong? If so, how was the doubt removed? Is it not possible that the doubt may be valid?"

The editor of *Review of Religions* (V, p. 150), it may be assumed with Aḥmad's acquiescence, wrote in reply :—

¹ *Review of Religions*, II, p. 405. See pp. 70, 71.

"The drift of the first two questions is that the revelations of the promised Messiah are due to dementia ; in other words, they are [not ?] revelations from God. . . . The diseases to which Mr. Daniel alludes were foretold by our Holy Prophet as being the signs of the promised Messiah." He then goes on to argue, by a somewhat forced interpretation, that a tradition had declared that the promised Messiah would make his appearance clad in garments dyed yellow,¹ and that, since "there is a consensus of opinion among all interpreters of dreams that yellow garments signify disease," the reference is, of course, to Aḥmad's two diseases, "syncope and polyuria." As far as there is any direct answer given here to Mr. Daniel's questions about the presence of mental irregularities in Aḥmad, it would seem to be in the affirmative, although, of course, there was no intention on the part of the writer to imply that any physical and mental irregularities of the human medium could be held to have interfered with the validity of the divine revelation. On the contrary, in Muslim eyes it might even strengthen his claims to pre-eminence in spiritual rank.² There seems to be a confusion here, however, between Mr. Daniel's allusion to brain disease and the Aḥmadiya reference to syncope and polyuria, as being Aḥmad's troubles, since actually those diseases do not affect the mind.

That he was neither insane nor a conscious imposter, but self-deluded, is the opinion of Dr. H. D. Griswold, of Lahore, who was personally acquainted with Aḥmad, and of whose paper, on "The Messiah of Qādiān," read before the Victoria Institute of Great Britain, the editor of the *Review of Religions* wrote, "Excepting occasional remarks, which were necessary to make the paper fit for reading in

¹ In the résumé of Muslim traditions regarding the second coming of Christ contained in the *Mukaddima* of Ibn Khaldūn, there is an obscure reference to the expected one descending at Damascus, "between two yellow robes," which may be what Aḥmad had in mind. See De Slane. Ed., *Quatremère*, Vol. II, p. 170.

² For the connection between idiocy and sainthood in Islām, see Macdonald, *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islām*, Chicago, 1909, pp. 103, 104.

a Christian meeting, the author has very clearly stated the necessary facts for forming a true idea of the Aḥmadiya movement, and has taken immense pains to collect from different places all the arguments bearing on the subject and to collate them in order." Dr. Griswold, in his pamphlet, *Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad, the Mehdi Messiah of Qādiān*,¹ wrote:—

"The opinions on this point concerning him may be summed up under three judgments: (1) that he is a conscious deceiver, (2) that he is insane, (3) that he is self-deluded." After quoting judgments of others in favour of each of the first two alternatives, Dr. Griswold gives his own opinion as follows:—

"On the whole, however, it seems to me that the third judgment is the safest one, namely, that the Mīrzā Ṣāhib is honest but self-deceived. So far as I am able to judge, his writings everywhere have the ring of sincerity. His persistency in affirming his claims in the face of the most intense and bitter opposition is magnificent. He is willing to *suffer* on behalf of his claims. And besides this, if, in the sober and matter-of-fact West, Dr. Dowie, of Chicago,² can claim to be the promised Elijah, we ought not to be surprised if, in the warmer and more imaginative East, Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān, has claimed to be the Messiah. To both alike may be granted a measure of pity on the ground that they are probable victims of unconscious self-deception."

I am indebted to Professor D. B. Macdonald, of Hartford, U.S.A., for the suggestion here advanced as perhaps best accounting for Aḥmad's claims and so-called revelations, viewed in the light of our modern knowledge of psychology. May not he, like his great leader, be best described as "a pathological case"? Let me quote here a few passages from Professor Macdonald's chapter on "The Person and Life of Muḥammad," in his *Aspects of Islām*,³ setting forth this theory of the nature of

¹ Published at Ludhiana, Panjab, in 1902.

² Cf. p. 45, Note 1.

³ Macmillan, New York, p. 63ff.

Muḥammad's inspiration:—"As I have said before, the fundamental thing in him was that he was a pathological case. It is evident that from comparatively early days he had trances; fell into fits in which he saw and heard strange things. There came to him voices, either apparently in a trance condition or when he was awake. Driven by fear for his soul, he had got into the habit of retiring into desert recesses, and there spending days in solitary prayer. So there the voices came to him; there he even saw figures—vague, dim—and the fear fell upon him, What are they? What is the matter with me? Is this of God? Or am I possessed by some spirit? . . . Again he was not, as so many have thought, a schemer, a politician, a man who set out to unite Arabia and to become its head, and who at every move knew exactly what he was doing and why he did it. He was not a schemer; he was very often the most impolitic of men. . . . So, then, I take it that the essential and characteristic elements in the prophetship, in the creed, in the personality, in the philosophy of Muḥammad all lead us back to something unhealthy, ununified; but to something also in its earlier phases, and through the greater part of its life and growth, absolutely sincere—absolutely, entirely real."

That Aḥmad also was to some extent sincere in his belief that his revelations (particularly the earlier ones which defined his unique office) came from some source that was external to his own mind all the evidence at our disposal would lead us to believe. His revelations for the most part came in brief, ejaculatory Arabic sentences.¹ A few of the early ones, however, came in English, a language which Aḥmad professed not to speak. Two instances of these English revelations, given by Mīrzā Yakūb Beg, are the following:—"I shall help you: You have to go Amritsar"; "He halts in the Zilla (township) Peshawar." It will be noticed that the English is imperfect.

That he later, like Muḥammad (according to Professor Macdonald's theory) and many modern mediums, produced

¹ See the translations of several of these revelations on p. 33.

alleged revelations that had been deliberately forged, in the interests (in his case) of a growing ambition and an ill-disguised cupidity, a mass of reliable evidence compels us to believe.

All that we know of Aḥmad's early years reveals in him the nervous, abstracted manner of the typical medium. As the revelations began to come—whether through automatic writing, or in a trance, or through some other means, we can only surmise—he was, let us say, profoundly moved by their mysterious nature and easily convinced of their having proceeded from a supernatural source. Thereupon he became, in his own eyes and in those of his followers, the “next step” in the divine scheme of progressive revelation, and possibly the inevitable centre of a proselytizing cult.

We can find many suggestive parallels of this mental and spiritual progression in the history of such modern mediums as D. D. Home and Rev. Stainton Moses, of a generation ago, and the late W. T. Stead and Elsa Barker in the past few years. In such cases it seems to be an easy, and indeed almost inevitable, thing for the controlling intelligence, whether it be “*Jibrail*” (Gabriel) or “Imperator,”¹ “Julia”² or “X,”³ to convince the medium that the source of the communications is wholly external to the personality of the “sensitive,” and that the medium has been chosen to be the vehicle of a divinely inspired revelation.⁴

The last ten years of Aḥmad's life were increasingly shadowed by physical weakness and characterised by waning aggressiveness, as he realised that he was drawing near

¹ Cf. M. A. Oxon (Rev. W. Stainton Moses): *Spirit Teachings*, London Spiritualist Alliance, 1894.

² Cf. W. T. Stead: “After Death—A Personal Narrative,” *Review of Reviews*, London, 1912.

³ Cf. Elsa Barker: *Letters from a Living Dead Man*. Wm. Rider & Sons, London, 1914.

⁴ A later example of this tendency is seen in the case of Sir Oliver Lodge's *Raymond*, which Sir Arthur Conan Doyle has called “A new revelation of God's dealing with man.” See Appendix I for quotations from a recent article in *Review of Religions*, in which further unconscious evidences are given of the mediumistic character of Aḥmad's revelation.

to the end. In December, 1905, he published his "Will,"¹ in which he wrote, "As Almighty God has informed me, in various revelations following one another, that the time of my death is near, and the revelations in that respect have been so many and so consecutive that they have shaken my existence from the foundations and made this life quite indifferent to me, I have, therefore, thought it proper that I should write down for my friends, and for such other persons as can benefit from my teachings, some words of advice." As will appear in Chapter VI, the content of this "Will" was destined to prove a source of controversy and division in the Aḥmadiya community in years to come.

A few days before his death he wrote a paper called "The Message of Peace,"² which he intended should be read in his presence at a religious conference in University Hall, Lahore, in May, 1908. While, even here, he could not refrain from repeating some of his customary carping criticism of Christianity and Hinduism, he nevertheless comes nearer than he had probably ever done before to exemplifying the principle which in this paper he lays down: "That religion does not deserve the name of religion which does not inculcate broad sympathy with humanity in general, nor does that person deserve to be called a human being who has not a sympathetic soul within him."

His death, caused by intestinal trouble, occurred very suddenly, on May 26th, 1908, in Lahore, whither he had come to attend the conference above mentioned, and to secure some medical assistance for his wife. His enemies made much of the fact that, with all his boasted prophetic knowledge, he should not have foreseen the date of his own death, which, had it accorded with his wishes and plans, would certainly have occurred in Qādiān, and at a later period. "The Message of Peace" was read at the conference by Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn, just after the author's death. Aḥmad was buried in an unpretentious tomb in Qādiān, which had been previously prepared.

¹ Obtainable in pamphlet form from the Qādiān headquarters.

² This can be obtained from Aḥmadiya headquarters at Qādiān. It appeared in the *Review of Religions* for July, 1908 (VII, p. 7). Cf. pp. 50, 51.

CHAPTER II

THE DISTINCTIVE CLAIMS OF AḤMAD

I. THE PROMISED MESSIAH

THE Sunnite Muslim believes that among the signs of the approach of the last day will be the simultaneous appearance of the promised Messiah and the expected Maḥḍi, generally taken to be two quite distinct personalities with different offices to perform.¹ Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad claimed to fulfil in himself various Muslim prophecies pertaining both to the Messiah and the Maḥḍi, and, in addition, to be the fulfilment of Christian and Jewish eschatological hopes. First, with regard to JEWISH prophecy, in a paper published in 1904 (cf. *Review of Religions*, III, p. 331), called "My Claim to Promised Messiahship," Aḥmad wrote :

"Since God created man, it has been his unchangeable law that he sheds his light upon mankind through one of their own number, so that there may be a unity and oneness among them. . . . In accordance with this time-honoured law, Almighty God prophesied by the mouth of his prophets that after nearly six thousand years from the time of Adam, when great darkness would pursue upon earth and an irresistible flood of passions would make the love of God wane and iniquity predominate, he would breathe into a man the soul of truth and love and knowledge spiritually after the likeness of Adam, and he would be called the Messiah, because God would himself anoint his soul with the ointment of his love. . . . After a heavy fight the Messiah of God would drive back the powers of darkness, and the glory, majesty, unity and holiness of God would be proclaimed upon earth and would continue to be so declared for a thousand years, the

¹ Perhaps the most satisfactory summary in English of the generally recognized signs of the Muslim millennial period preceding the day of resurrection is that contained in Sale: *Preliminary Discourse to the Koran*, Ed. 1877, Sect. IV, pp. 56-59, to which the reader is referred. I mention here only those prophecies of which Aḥmad makes use.

seventh day of the Holy Books of God. Then will be the end. I am that Messiah : let him who will accept me."

We thus see that the promised Messiah is, for Jews, Christians and Muḥammadans the second Adam as well as the promised Messiah. The reference to Adam is of importance, on account of the Muslim designation of Jesus as "the second Adam," because he was declared by Muḥammad to have been an immediate creation like the first Adam.¹ In the first number of the *Review of Religions* (I, p. 15) this parallelism is further developed :

"The thousand years of Satan's supremacy (following the thousand years of his imprisonment after the coming of Jesus) have come to an end, and we are now living in the millenium of God's reign, and the dawn of it has already appeared. The sixth thousand from the appearance of Adam has come to a close, and the seventh, in which the second Adam should have appeared, has begun. God made Adam on the sixth day, and the sacred Scriptures further bear testimony to the fact that a day is equal to a thousand years with the Lord.

"The promises of God, therefore, make it absolutely necessary that the second Adam must have been born already, though not recognized as yet by the world. We cannot further avoid the conclusion that the place fixed by God for the appearance of the second Adam must be in the East and not in the West, for from Genesis 2 : 8, we learn that God had put the first Adam in a garden *eastward*. It is, therefore, necessary that the second Adam should appear in the *East*, in order to have a resemblance with the first in respect of his locality. This conclusion is equally binding upon the Christians and the Muḥammadans if they admit the authority of their Scriptures and are not of an atheistic turn of mind."

The thousand-year imprisonment of Satan after Jesus' second coming is taken from Revelation 20 : 1-10. There is nothing corresponding to it in Muslim eschatology. In another passage Ahmad writes :

"Moreover Adam was born on Friday, and along with him was born a woman. So it happened in my case, *viz.*, I, too, was born on Friday and was born a twin, a girl being born with me."²

¹ Cf. Qur'ān, III, 52.

² According to Muslim writers Adam was born in the third hour of the sixth day, and Eve in the sixth hour. See article, "Adam" in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. I, p. 178. This may possibly be a distant echo of the legend of "Lilith," who figures in Jewish rabbinical writings as the first wife of Adam. See article "Lilith," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, VIII, p. 87.

Moses as well as Adam is included in the method of parallelism by which Aḥmad claimed to fulfil the Jewish Messianic prophecies. The argument in this connection is well summarized by Dr. Griswold, who heard it from Aḥmad's own lips at Qādiān :

"There are two tribes of fundamental importance in Divine revelation, the Children of Israel and the Children of Ishmael. The great prophets of the former were Moses and Christ. Christ was the final prophet of the Jews, the last brick in their national and religious structure. Their rejection of Christ involved their own rejection and the loss of their nationality. Then came the turn of the children of Ishmael, 'According to Deuteronomy 18: 18,¹ a prophet was raised "like unto" Moses, from among the "brethren" of the Israelites, in the person of the great lawgiver Muḥammad' (*Review of Religions*, May, 1902, p. 206). Muḥammad, therefore, was the first Ishmaelitish prophet, as it were, the *Moses of Islām*. But Moses and Christ were separated by an interval of twelve or fourteen centuries. Hence, in order to preserve the parallelism, another prophet must arise twelve or fourteen centuries after Muḥammad, who will be, as it were, the *Christ of Islām*. Who can this be but Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān? The relation between these great prophets may be set forth in the form of a proportion. Thus, as Moses is to Christ, so Muḥammad is to Ghulām Aḥmad; or again, as Muḥammad is to Moses, so the Mīrzā Ṣāhib is to Jesus Christ. In a word, as Moses is a type of Muḥammad, so Jesus of Nazareth is a type of Aḥmad of Qādiān.'²

The words of Isaiah 41: 2,³ "Who has raised the righteous one in the East," are likewise quoted in the *Review of Religions* as an instance of Old Testament prophecy which was fulfilled in Aḥmad.

Coming now to the CHRISTIAN prophecies, contained in the New Testament, Aḥmad held that the second coming

¹ This prophecy is universally held by Muslims to be a reference to Muḥammad, who claimed descent from Ishmael. Most Christian commentators on Deuteronomy agree with Driver, in *The International Critical Commentary*, "Deuteronomy," p. 227: "The reference here is to a permanent institution (of prophetship), not to a particular individual prophet." Other Scriptural passages which Muslims apply to Muḥammad are: Deuteronomy 33: 2; Isaiah 21: 6; the parable in Matthew 20; John 4: 21; John 16: 7; 1 John 4: 1-3, and many more. For the best study of this subject, see article by Goldziher in the *Zeitschrift* of the J.O.S., Vol. XLII, pp. 591ff.

² Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad, *the Mehdi Messiah of Qādiān*, p. 21.

³ The reference is to Cyrus, according to G. A. Smith, O. C. Whitehouse, and other Old Testament commentators. See "Isaiah," in *The Century Bible*, Vol. II, p. 65.

of the Messiah was not to be in Christ's own person, but in his "spirit and power." Even so, Jesus declared that John had come in the "spirit and power" of Elijah (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 192), when the Jews urged that Jesus could not be the Messiah because the prophecy of Malachi 4: 5, was still unfulfilled, that Elijah must come again previous to the Messiah's appearance (Matt. 17: 12; cf. Luke 2: 17). Elijah and Jesus, he held, were the two characters of whom it was said in the Bible that they were taken up alive into heaven. Hence their return to earth would presumptively be the same in its nature. In spite of the contradictions involved, it was necessary for Aḥmad's purpose that he also teach that Muslims are in error in believing that Jesus was taken alive into one of the heavens from whence he will return before the last day, just as Christians err, no less, in their belief that Jesus died on the cross and after his resurrection in three days ascended to heaven, there to remain until his second appearance. Aḥmad held it to be of supreme importance to his claims that Jesus should have died like an ordinary man,¹ so as to make his appearance in his actual physical body previous to the general resurrection impossible, thus making possible his own (Aḥmad's) coming in Jesus' spirit and power. We read that the signs which ought to accompany the return of the Messiah have all been fulfilled:

"Earthquakes, plague, famine, wars, and terrestrial as well as heavenly phenomena, bear witness to the one fact that there is to be no more waiting for the Messiah's advent" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 397).

Christians themselves, he declared, recognize that the time is at hand, but, like the Jews of the time of Jesus, they are looking in the wrong direction for his appearance. The *Millennial Dawn* books of the late "Pastor" Russell, in America, are quoted to prove that the six thousandth year after Adam, at the end of which the Messiah must come, ended in 1873, and that by 1914 the saints were to

Aḥmad's theory regarding Jesus' death and burial is set forth in Chapter IV, p. 89ff.

be gathered and the Kingdom was to be firmly established and recognized by all.¹

Other Christian writers, he asserts, have placed the time of the advent in 1898, 1899 and 1900; but all have been disappointed because they failed to realize that in Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān the Messiah has actually appeared (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 366).

We come now to the MUSLIM prophecies of Jesus' return to earth. The only reference to this in the Qur'ān is the dubious one in XLIII, 61,² which some commentators take to refer rather to the Qur'ān itself. Nevertheless, we are told in the *Review of Religions* (II, p. 369):

"The Qur'ān has wisely fixed certain signs for the advent of the Messiah, so that all men might know from their fulfilment that the time is come. Of these the most important sign is the predominance of the Christian religion and the activity of the Christian nations in every department of life. Of this predominance and activity there is not the least doubt."

Aḥmad, unfortunately, does not inform us where in the Qur'ān this prophecy is to be found, but he (or his editor) asks pertinently in the same paragraph:

"If the Messiah is not needed now, will he be needed when the whole world is led to believe in the false doctrine of which the Holy Qur'ān has said: 'The heavens might almost be rent thereat and the earth cleave asunder, and the mountains fall in pieces'?"³

A favourite argument from the Qur'ān is based upon the well-known verse (LXI, 6), which reads:

"And (remember) when Jesus, the Son of Mary, said, O Children of Israel; of a truth I am God's Apostle to you to confirm the law which was given before me, and to announce an Apostle that shall come after me, whose name shall be Aḥmad."

¹ See *Studies in the Scriptures* (in earlier editions, *The Millennial Dawn*), Series 2, "The Time is at Hand," Studies 2 and 4, pp. 33ff. Published by the International Bible Students' Association, Brooklyn, N.Y., 1916.

² "And he (it) shall be a sign of the last hour; doubt not then of it, and follow ye me: this is the right way" (Rodwell's translation, p. 139).

³ Qur'ān XIX, 92. The preceding verse gives the "false doctrine" as follows:—"They say: 'The God of Mercy hath begotten offspring.' Now have ye done a monstrous thing" (Rodwell's translation, p. 123). Muḥammad interpreted in a carnal sense the Christian doctrine that Jesus is the Son of God.

As there is no such saying of Jesus in the New Testament, orthodox Islām has followed the suggestion of Maracci, adopted by Sale (*Preliminary Discourse*, Ed. 1877, Sect. IV, p. 53), that the references to the "Paraclete," in John 14: 26 and 16: 7, were believed by Muḥammad to point to himself, the original Greek word having been, in this case, not *Parakletos* but *Periklutos*, which is equivalent to the Arabic word, *Aḥmad* ("praised"). The word, "Muḥammad," comes of course from the same root. Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad takes the prediction, in both the Gospel and the Qur'ān, to refer not to Muḥammad but to himself, because he bears the name "Aḥmad" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 266), although, as Dr. Griswold has pointed out, his entire name really signifies "Servant of Aḥmad" (Ghulām Aḥmad).

A further sign of the last days, which we are frequently told is referred to in the Qur'ān and given in detail in a tradition, is that an eclipse of the sun and moon will then occur, respectively, on the 13th and 28th of the month of Ramaḍan.¹ This occurred in 1894. Although the earliest collections of traditions contain few references to the last day, later Muḥammadan literature abounds in traditions that give the signs supposed to precede and accompany the end.² Among the many to which Aḥmad refers at different times are the corruption of the Muḥammadan priests, the neglect of the Qur'ān, and the splitting of Islām into sects. Aḥmad quotes frequently the well-known tradition of Abū Hurairah, that the Son of Mary when he descends shall break in pieces the cross and shall slay the swine.³ Aḥmad declared that it was evident that he had fulfilled this prophecy by exposing finally the falsity of the Christian doctrine of salvation through the cross of Christ, and by the destructive curses he pronounced upon his various enemies, who, he declared, represent the

¹ The tradition is included in the *Masābīh as sunna* of Al Baghāwī, Cairo, Vol. II, p. 147. It is not in the Qur'ān.

² Sale (*Preliminary Discourse*, Sect. IV, p. 56ff) gives many of the signs found in the various traditions, together with their sources.

³ For reference to this tradition, see De Slane's edition of the *Mukaddima* of Ibn Khaldūn, Ed. Quatremère, Vol. II, p. 163.

swine referred to in the prophecy. Among other prophetic signs pointing to the present as the time for the Messiah's descent, it is said that the promised Messiah is to fight with the anti-Christ (*Dajjāl*), who will come riding on an ass which moves like a cloud driven by the wind. He will have but one eye, and with him will be all the treasures of the world. This, we learn, refers to the coming of the English to India, particularly the missionaries—the ass being the railways and the cloud the steam from the engines. Since the English have an eye for the things of this world only, and are blind in the eye of religion, they may be considered as one-eyed; and certainly they are exceedingly rich! The rising of the sun in the west, another prophecy, likewise refers to the coming of the English, resplendent in worldly glory. And the strife of Gog and Magog (*Yājūj* and *Mājūj*), referred to in the Qur'ān (XVIII, 93, 97 and XXI, 96) and in the Bible (Ezek. 39: 1, 6, and Rev. 20: 8), whose "appearance in history in terrific combat is to be a sign of the last days," refers to the war between England and Russia. In one place we read:

"Among other signs related in the Holy Qur'ān and authentic traditions are the appearance of the plague which is at present (1903) devastating India and several other countries, the introduction of a new mode of conveyance in place of camels, etc., which has been fulfilled by the construction of railways throughout the world, the increase of knowledge, the mixing together of people living in distant lands, the multiplicity of canals, the spreading of papers, and a host of other signs which we cannot detail here" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 369).

The above are but a few of the prophecies which Aḥmad declared were fulfilled in himself. Whenever he discoursed on this subject some orthodox maulvī was ready with a new prophecy, buried in some obscure tradition: and, in due time, Aḥmad was prepared to reveal how this prophecy, rightly understood, could refer only to himself.

Thus far we have been dealing with the prophecies of the promised Messiah's coming. Another alleged proof of Aḥmad's Messiahship was the fact that revelation early identified him with Jesus—the Jesus of the Christian

Gospels, mentioned as 'Īsā so often in the Qur'ān. Referring to *Sūrat-al-Tahrīm*, Aḥmad wrote:

"It is plainly indicated that some one from among the Muslims will first acquire the characteristics of Mary on account of his perfect righteousness, and be called by that name, and then the spirit of Jesus being breathed into him, he will be called by the latter name. In accordance with those words of the Holy Qur'ān, Almighty God first named me Mary, and then spoke of the breathing into me of a soul, and lastly he named me Jesus" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 421).¹

In the course of the revelations recorded in the pages of the *Barāhin-i-Aḥmadiya*, one occurred in which Aḥmad was thus addressed:

"O Mary, enter with thy companions into paradise, I have breathed into thee from myself the spirit of truth" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 340).

The resemblance to the verse of the Qur'ān, just referred to, is obvious. This spirit, Aḥmad declared, was the spirit of Jesus, as indicated to him by a revelation, occurring two years later, applying to himself the verse of the Qur'ān:

"O Jesus, verily I will cause thee to die a natural death, and will take thee up to myself, and I will place those who follow thee above those who believe not in thee, until the day of Resurrection" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 341).²

At the time Aḥmad supposed that these revelations referred to the ordinary Muslim belief regarding the second advent of Jesus, and it was not until some years after that it was further revealed to him, as above narrated.

"My name is Jesus, Son of Mary, for my capacity of Jesus is an offspring of my capacity as Mary."

In Aḥmad's challenge to a prayer-duel to the death, issued to Dr. John Alexander Dowie, the American "Messiah,"³ in 1892, the revelations seem to have gone

¹ We find no such reference in *Sūrat-al-Tahrīm*, but we suppose Aḥmad must have had in mind the last verse (LXVI, 12): "And Mary, the daughter of Imran, who kept her maidenhood, and into whose womb we breathed of our spirit, and who believed in the words of her Lord and his scriptures, and was one of the devout" (Rodwell's translation, p. 465).

² Qur'ān III, 48.

³ Cf. p. 45, Note 1.

the length of convincing Aḥmad not only of his likeness, but further of his *superiority*, to Jesus. After describing how on various occasions he has seen Jesus and eaten with him from the same dish, he proceeds :

“There is no doubt that Divine wisdom has entrusted a far greater and more important work to my charge, and has given me promises of a far greater kindness and grace, yet spiritually Jesus and I are one in essence. It is for this reason that my advent is his advent. He who denies me denies Jesus also. He saw me and was pleased, and, therefore, he who sees me and is not pleased with me is not of us, neither of me nor of Jesus. Jesus is from me and I am from God ; blessed is he who recognizes me, and undone is the person from whose eyes I am hidden.”

And again he writes distinctly :

“The Son of Mary has not the slightest superiority over other men ; nay, we can point to men who have been far superior to him. And in this age, the writer of these pages has been sent to convince people that he enjoys a greater grace and favour in the sight of God than Jesus Christ” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 340).

And yet again :

“Ye Christian missionaries : say no more that Christ is your God, for there is one among you who is greater than Christ” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 251).

Detailed evidences of his superiority are given in an article in the *Review of Religions* for May, 1902 (I, p. 206):

“I wonder what peculiarities there are in the Son of Mary which make him a God. Do these consist in his miracles? But mine are greater than his. Were his prophecies very clear and true? But I shall be guilty of concealing a truth if I do not assert that the prophecies which Almighty God has granted me are of a far better quality in clearness, force and truth, than the ambiguous predictions of Jesus. Can we conclude his divinity from the words used of him in the Gospels? But I swear by the Lord . . . that the words expressing my dignity revealed from God . . . are far more weighty and glorious than the words of the Gospels relating to Jesus. But, notwithstanding all this superiority, I cannot assert Divinity or Sonship of God. . . . My superiority lies in being the Messiah of Muḥammad, as Jesus was the Messiah of Moses, the Israelite Law-giver.”

Later than this a revelation came to Aḥmad, in Arabic as on most occasions, of which a literal translation would

be: "Thou art to me as a Son.¹ Thou art from me and I from thee" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 349). A further evidence of Ahmad's superiority to Jesus lay, he declared, in the fact that he was saved by the grace of Muḥammad from the possibility of such an ignominious death as Jesus suffered at the hands of his enemies.

In addition to pointing to the agreement of past prophecy and present revelation in declaring his indentity with or superiority to Jesus, Ahmad boasted a similarity to Christ in his external situation and in his personal character. Like Jesus, Ahmad was destined first to suffer persecution at the hands of unbelievers.

"The world shall not recognize him before his glorious advent; for he is not of the world. Nor shall the world love him; for he comes from the God whom the world does not love. It is, therefore, necessary that he should be abused, persecuted and charged with all manner of crime" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 17).

As the enemies of Jesus were the supposedly religious and orthodox Scribes and Pharisees, so to-day the professedly religious people and their leaders are, because of their sins, most sharply antagonistic to the spirit and claims of the Messiah. In Christendom, he declared, drunkenness, prostitution and gambling were rampant, and the clergy and missionaries set the example. Reference is made, in the *Review of Religions* for May, 1906 (V, p. 215), to a book to which I have no access, called *Crimes of Preachers*, which, says the editor, has a brief record of some of the crimes with which clergy of the United States and Canada have been charged in courts. There is no unnameable crime from which the "love of Christ" has saved the holy men, adultery and seduction heading the list. Intelligent and unbiassed Muslims, as well as Christians, must exclaim at the studied unfairness of such a representation of Christianity and its leaders in the East and West.

¹ This revelation is of special interest in view of Muḥammad's inability to conceive of such a *spiritual* sonship as that of Jesus to the Father from the Christian viewpoint. Ahmad here seems to declare himself boldly a son of God, although he elsewhere echoes the common Muslim deprecation of the term as applied to Jesus.

But neither does Islām come through unscathed. It is condemned by Aḥmad for its sectarianism, ceremonialism, hard-heartedness and superstitious saint-worship. We are told that "Muḥammadan degeneration has passed all bounds. Luxurious habits, transgressions, drunkenness, gambling and laziness have gained the upper hand" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 318).

And this decadence is due to, and most extensively found among, the maulvīs themselves. "The blame of depriving a whole world of the recognition of Islāmic truths lies at the door of the maulvīs," because they have "fabricated poisonous traditions" and their own lives are corrupt. Even so, "at the time of Jesus' advent, the Jewish priests and religious leaders were morally in a very degraded condition, and though the word of virtue was on their lips yet their hearts were quite devoid of it."

If the moral conditions of the Christian and Muḥammadan world to-day are similar to those in Jewish society when Jesus came, so also are political conditions among Muslims to-day similar to those of the Jews of the first century. The Jews were a subject people, under the yoke of Rome, and to-day "Muḥammadanism has ceased to be the ruling power in the country where the Promised Messiah has been raised, and English rule has been established in its stead." And as Jesus did not seek to foster a spirit of revolution among the Jews, but remained loyal to Rome, so was the Mīrzā Ṣāhib, like his forbears, a loyal subject of the British Rāj. Moreover, as Jesus was dragged before a Roman tribunal, so has Aḥmad been hailed before the English courts on several occasions, and as Jesus was declared innocent by Pilate, so, Aḥmad declares, he also was discharged as innocent by the British official who presided when one of his famous cases was tried.

Most important of all, Aḥmad seems to have held, was the resemblance between himself and Jesus in character and office. In sketching this analogy he considers Jesus only in the favourable light and with the mature moral personality in which the Gospels present him. In a

later chapter¹ we shall find him portraying a different and strangely inconsistent picture of Jesus, giving to him a character with which Aḥmad would hardly desire to associate himself in the popular mind. He declares that in his single personality the spirituality of both Muḥammad and Jesus "pervades his whole being, and, as it were, supplies the fuel which keeps up the heat of his spiritual life."

He has inherited the "untold perfections of the Holy Prophet" and likewise "the perfection of Jesus Christ."² And as the personality of the Promised Messiah was quite blended with these two personalities, and was wholly lost in them, therefore the names of these two chosen ones of God predominated over his own name, and in heaven the names of these two great ones were appropriated for him." (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 67).

As with Jesus, so with Aḥmad, between his first coming to persecution and his second advent in glory, his innocence will be established upon earth:—

"When the perfect man has passed through all these stages and undergone all these trials, when his magnanimity, constancy, patience and determination shine forth in their full glory and his innocence is established with conclusive arguments, then is the time of his advent in glory, and the time of his first advent, which was a time of trials and persecutions, comes to an end" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 16).

Like Jesus he was an intercessor³ between God and man, and, as such, necessarily, a manifestation at once of the Divine Being and of a perfected humanity. He declared himself to be

¹ Cf. p. 81ff.

² On the sinlessness of Jesus and Muḥammad see p. 81, Note 1.

³ Obviously Aḥmad's conception of intercession is not that of orthodox Islām, which for the most part holds that only Muḥammad will be the intercessor at the last day. According to a well-known tradition from Anas, the Prophet said that Jesus will be unable to intercede on the day of resurrection, not (as in the case of other prophets) because he has sinned, but because his followers worshipped him as a God. The Qur'ān admits of no intercession, strictly speaking, although some commentators have held that Qur'ān XCVII, 40, admits the intercession of Jesus. Many traditions affirm the intercession of Muḥammad. For a discussion of this subject see *The Faith of Islām*, by E. Sell (S.P.C.K., Madras, 1907, third edition), p. 263ff. See also p. 121, Note 1.

Aḥmad probably has in mind here the references to the intercession of Jesus given in the Epistle to the Hebrews, 7 : 25.

“The real intercessor of mankind, because I am the perfect image of the great intercessor who was born thirteen centuries ago and rejected by the blind men of his time” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 251).

In various passages he refers to himself, or is referred to, as “Son of God,”¹ “Sun of Righteousness,” “an angel inspired by God,” an image of God whom imperfect human beings must imitate in order to be regenerated (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 393), “the living model whose example all must imitate,” “an infallible guide,” “no mere mortal,” “Saviour from the bondage of sin,” “Mediator between God and man,” the spiritual leader of this age (*Imām-uz-Zamān*), the *Ḥakam*, or divinely appointed arbitrator in religious affairs within and without Islām, a “looking-glass for the divine image” (appropriating the familiar figure of the *Ṣūfis*) and “His holiness.”

It has already become evident from quotations given that Aḥmad considered that he had come in “the spirit and power” not only of Jesus, but in some sense of Muḥammad also. He called himself the *burūz*, or manifestation, “the living representation upon earth of the Arabian Prophet.”

“The wise and knowing God has raised *Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad* of *Qādiān* with the same spirit and power, the same blessings and favours, and the same miracles, with which he raised the Holy Prophet” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 333).

There is here an indication, which his extravagant claims enforce, that he was greater even than Muḥammad, for after asserting that his powers and resources are like Muḥammad’s in kind, he declares that in Aḥmad’s time “even greater evils and corruption had appeared in the world,” which would seem to imply that Aḥmad’s necessary manifestation of power must have exceeded Muḥammad’s.

II. THE EXPECTED MAḤDI

The confusing multiplicity and diversity of Muslim traditions relating to the signs of the approach of “The Day” characterise particularly the references to the

¹ Cf. p. 34, Note I.

Maḥdi (literally, "guided one"). It is clear that he is a descendant of the Prophet, and the last of the Imāms (the successors of the Prophet)—who, according to Sunnite Muslims, is to come upon earth at the last day, and in victorious warfare make Islām to prevail throughout the world. Thus far the traditions are agreed, but from that point onward they diverge. Some would have the rule of the Maḥdi overthrown by *Dajjāl* (anti-Christ), in order that *Dajjāl* in turn may be destroyed by 'Īsā, whose expected return to earth has crept into Islām from Christian eschatology. There has, however, been a persistent tradition in Muslim eschatological literature that "there is no Maḥdi except Jesus."¹ This tradition Aḥmad accepted as against all others contradicting it. Moreover, the usual Muslim idea of the Maḥdi is that he will be a "man of blood," leading Islām forth on its last great *jihād* (holy war), a character which has been sustained by most other modern claimants to Maḥdiship. This conception would have been a most inconvenient (though not an impossible) one for Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad to have held, with his boasted peaceableness and friendliness to British rule in India, and we find him repudiating it vigorously, and, along with it, the customary view of *jihād*, which, he held, had reference to spiritual rather than to physical warfare.² Aḥmad summed up his position as follows:

"The spiritual personality of the Messiah and the Maḥdi is a combination of the spiritual personalities of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad and Jesus."

¹ To be found in De Slane, Ed. Quatremère, *Mukaddima* of Ibn Khaldūn, Vol. II, p. 163, and also quoted by De Massignon in his edition of *Kitāb al Tawāsīn*, by Al-Hallāj, Paris, 1913, p. 161, Note 2. Snouck Hurgronje, in *Mohammedanism*, New York, 1916, p. 108, speaks of the use of this tradition in Turkish official classes to-day, to prove that the true Maḥdi must descend from the clouds, thus tending to discredit all pseudo-Maḥdis arising from human society.

² This question of *jihād* will be considered further in Chapter III (p. 71ff), as it is a fundamental point in the differentiation of the Aḥmadiya sect from orthodox Islām. It is discussed at length by Maulvī Sher 'Alī, B.A., one of Aḥmad's followers, in *Review of Religions*, VII, pp. 174-185, 193, 221, 291-320, 337-371, 377-404.

And again :

“To believe in me as the Promised Messiah and Maḥḍi is to disbelieve in the popular doctrine of *jihād*.”

It is hardly worth while quoting at length the various arguments by which Aḥmad sought to prove from the traditions that he was the expected Maḥḍi as well as the promised Messiah. His main point was that the traditions are hopelessly contradictory, and that the only possible criterion by which the true traditions can be distinguished from the false would be the actual appearance of the Maḥḍi, fulfilling certain of the prophecies and thus stamping them as true. In one line of argument, to establish the identity of Messiah and Maḥḍi, he asserted that since in many traditions the word “Maḥḍi” may be taken not as a proper name but as a descriptive title, and since the offices of the Messiah and Maḥḍi are constantly confused or blended, and since the signs attending the advent of each are not distinguishable, it follows that Maḥḍi is only a title of the promised Messiah, and that therefore any traditions regarding the Maḥḍi which cannot be adjusted to apply to the now apparent promised Messiah, Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad, must, *ipso facto*, be false.

We have now seen that Aḥmad believed that he fulfilled the prophecies relating to the promised Messiah and the expected Maḥḍi, and that his personal character validated his claim. There remained a further test from which he did not shrink, and he confessed that it was the final criterion of prophethood and Messiahship. This was the presence of those outward signs for which the Scribes and Pharisees asked Jesus, and for which the Qureish¹ asked Muḥammad. Muḥammad, according to the later traditions accepted by Aḥmad, and in contradiction of the obvious teaching of the Qur’ān,² responded by showing the requisite signs.

¹ The ruling family of Mecca, to which Muḥammad belonged.

² Cf. Qur’ān, VI, 109. For miracles later ascribed to Muḥammad see *Two Hundred and Fifty-two Authentic Miracles of Muḥammad*, by Maulvī Muḥammad Ināyat Aḥmad, Moḥammedan Tract and Book Depot, Lahore, 1894, mentioned in Zwemer, *The Moslem Christ*, Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 164, Note 1.

“What was it happened in the sandy deserts of Arabia? The dead were raised to life in thousands, the blind were made to see, the dumb were made to utter words of heavenly wisdom, and the depraved of long generations were clothed in divine morals” (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 46).

And again :

“As regards our Holy Prophet, there are about a million of his words in which we witness clear manifestations of his light and divine glory.”

The promised Messiah, likewise, never disappointed the honest seeker after a sign, but, as he monotonously reiterated, “has shown more than one hundred and fifty supernatural signs, to which evidence is borne by millions of men, and anyone who demands a sign even now in earnest is not disappointed” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 368).

A favourite method of attracting attention was to offer a sum of money to any seeker who should come to Qādiān and go away not satisfied with having seen a sign. We have never heard of any money having been paid over, although we have reason to believe, from the nature and continuance of the opposition to Aḥmad, much of it in the immediate environs of Qādiān, that some who came were not, or would not be, satisfied. On the other hand, sums of money were on several occasions offered publicly by his enemies if Aḥmad would prove himself to be the Messiah, and this, of course, he could not do to their satisfaction. On one occasion a prominent member (Shaikh Muḥammad Chittu) of the Ahl-i-Qur’ān sect of Muslims in the Panjab,¹ offered Rs. 25,000 if the Mīrẓā Ṣāhib would prove in debate that he was the promised Messiah. As far as I can learn, the offer was not accepted.

The nature of Aḥmad’s signs varied. As the miracle *par excellence* of Islām is the Qur’ān,² and the Arabic poetry

¹ A sect founded in 1902 by one, Abdulla Chakrālvi, who was at one time a pupil of Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn of Qādiān. He taught that the inspired Qur’ān, not Muḥammad, is the true *Rasūl* (Messenger) and rejected the *hadīs* with all the traditions relating to the life of Muḥammad. The sect differs in many other important matters from orthodox Islām. In the 1911 Census Report 271 persons were entered as followers of this sect.

² Cf. Qur’ān X, 38, 39; IV, 84, etc.

contained therein, so Aḥmad boasted of his own Arabic and his ventures in Arabic poetry as miraculous signs given him from above. He once offered to give Rs. 10,000 to any Muslim who should produce in twelve days an Arabic ode of equal excellence with the one he himself would indite. The main burden of his ode, written at the time, *Qāside Ījāzia* ("Qderaculous Ode") was the falseness of Shī'ite Muslims, whom he called *mushriks*¹ like the Christians. The same challenge accompanied his *Ījāz-ul-Masīh*, "a miraculous Arabic commentary on the *Ṣūrat-al-Fātiha*"² (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 495).

Aḥmad likewise claimed some remarkable discoveries relating to the origin of words. For instance, he declared that *Khinzir*, the Arabic word for pig, was derived from *Khinz*, meaning "very foul," and *ar*, meaning "I see"; and that similarly *su'ar* (pig) in Urdu is composed of two compounds also meaning "I see foul"; so he concludes, "*Su'ar* is therefore an Arabic word, and the reason of its prohibition is now evident" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 99). By other such examples, which the philologist will find equally amusing, Aḥmad sought to prove what he calls "one of the greatest discoveries of the age," that Arabic is the mother of all languages.³

In this connection he announced that "the descriptive words of ignorant Bedouins disclose treasures of scientific facts, which, we know not how many thousands of years afterwards, were discovered by the world (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 79).

One of his typical "great discoveries" was announced in a pamphlet published in 1898, entitled *A Revealed Cure for the Bubonic Plague*. The *Marhām-i-Īsā* (Ointment

¹ To the Aḥmadī the Sunnite Muslim is a *kāfir* (unbeliever) simply, whereas the Shī'ite, whose doctrine of the death and intercession of Imām Husain is held to be analogous to the Christian worship of Jesus, is called a *mushrik*: i.e., one who attributes to God a *shārik* or partner. This is the sin of *shirk*.

² "The Chapter of the Opener," placed at the beginning of the Qur'ān. This is recited several times during the five daily prayers, and has been called the Muslim Lord's Prayer.

³ Cf. Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad: *The Teachings of Islām*, Luzac & Co., London, 1910, p. 131.

of Jesus), which was declared to be "spoken of by the Jewish, Christian, Parsi and Muḥammadan physicians" and of which "over a thousand books on medicine contain a description," the very medicine which miraculously healed Jesus' wounds after he had been removed from the cross in a swoon, was now offered for sale by Aḥmad as a miraculous remedy for the plague, "prepared solely under the influence of divine inspiration." This remedy disappeared from the market as the result of an order issued by the Deputy Commissioner of Lahore, dated 19th October, 1899, followed by the decision of the Chief Court of the Panjab in the appealed case, dated 8th June, 1900.

An Aḥmadiya heresy, sometimes put forward as an unique discovery and a sign of Aḥmad's prophetship, was the denial of the presence in the Qur'ān of any so-called abrogated verses. In asserting this belief Aḥmad was running counter to the universal agreement *ijmā'* of the Muslim people.¹

In the latest life of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad, by Mīrzā Yakūb Beg, a number of specific miracles are ascribed to Aḥmad, such as the finding of a dead scorpion in his bed, and, most important, his restoration to life of a boy who had been drowned. It is further recorded that after the miraculous resuscitation of the youth, he almost immediately passed away. It may be to that incident that Aḥmad referred in the following sentence: "I also swear by the sacred name of God that I have restored the dead to life in the manner in which the divine law has allowed it" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 205).

The chief miraculous signs to which Aḥmad laid claim, however, were his alleged prophecies of future events. In this connection he writes:

"Prophecy in fact is the only supernatural evidence that can carry a conviction to all reasonable minds at a time of great scientific advancement when everything must needs be put to the scientific test, and this is the reason why the wise and foreseeing God has, in his

¹ For an exhaustive summary of the orthodox view of abrogation (*mansūkh*) see article by D. B. Macdonald, in *Moslem World*, VII, p. 420ff.

last and living book, brought prophecy to the front and laid stress upon it while he has thrown other miracles into the background as not being evidence of the highest type, inasmuch as performances by sleight of hand or showman's tricks, or other mechanical or optical deceptions, on account of their strong resemblance with the miraculous, take away the whole force of the evidence " (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 315).

The prophecies of which Aḥmad boasted most constantly had to do with the death or humiliation of his enemies, and were as much curses as prophecies. Although he frequently writes of "hundreds" of such instances, we find him referring in detail to comparatively few. These select cases were his prophecies of the death of his two arch-enemies, Pandit Lekh Ram, of the Ārya Samāj, and Mr. Abdulla Atham, E.A.C., a prominent Indian Christian, and (less often) Chirāgh Dīn, the apostate from the Aḥmadiya ranks, and Dr. John Alexander Dowie,¹ in America. The most definite prophecy of them all was that which declared that Pandit Lekh Ram would die within six years of the time of the promulgation of the prophecy, "and the 'Īd (Muḥammadan festival) will be very near to it." Four years after the prophecy appeared, on the 6th of March, the day following the most important 'Īd (the 'Īd-uz-Zuhā or Bakr 'Īd, called simply "the 'Īd" in India), Pandit Lekh Ram was the victim of an assassin's dagger. The members of the Ārya Samāj, and many others, not unnaturally believed that the prophecy and the murder had a sinister connection of cause and effect quite different from that which was urged by Aḥmad. Through the instrumentality, chiefly, of his first and most powerful Muslim opponent, Maulvī Muḥammad Husain, Aḥmad was constrained by an order of the Government, dated February 24th, 1899, to promise hereafter:—

"To refrain from publishing any prediction involving the disgrace of any person, or in which any one should be represented as an object of God's displeasure.

"To refrain from publishing any challenge to appeal to God to indicate by the signs of his displeasure, such as disgrace, etc., the party in a religious controversy which is in the wrong.

"To refrain from publishing any writing purporting to be an *inspiration* the object of which can be reasonably taken to be the dis-

¹ Cf. p. 45. Note 1.

grace of any person, or the representing of him as the object of the Divine wrath."

The case of Mr. Abdulla Atham was interesting because, although his prophesied death and descent to hell was widely heralded, he was still living after the allotted time (fifteen months) had expired. Aḥmad then issued a whole series of explanations. He declared that the *purport* of the prophecy was that whichever of the two (Atham or himself) was a liar would die within the life-time of the other. This would be fulfilled. The *condition* of the prophecy was, "unless he turn to the truth." He was alleged to have shown signs of relenting, so that, in accordance with "the well-known laws of prophecy," a respite had been granted. The *details* of the prophecy were indefinite, and "such details are only manifested after their fulfilment." Finally, he admitted that he might have been wrong. "It also happens that an error occurs sometimes in the interpretation of a prophecy, for, after all, prophets are mortals." For instance, "Jesus had prophesied that his twelve apostles would sit on twelve thrones, whereas one of them became the devil's in his own life-time" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 350). When, however, Mr. Abdulla Atham, then an old man, died eighteen months later, Aḥmad declared that the original prophecy had been triumphantly fulfilled (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 148).

He was always eager to engage his enemies in "prayer-duels," believing that by such means God would bring destruction upon the hypocrite. We read, "Christian missionaries are reported to be very courageous. They do not, it is said, hesitate to lay down even their lives for the sake of their religion. But they have proved very chicken-hearted before Aḥmad. None ventures to engage with Aḥmad in a prayer contest" (*Review of Religions*, V, p. 461). Probably no one sentence could better illustrate his fundamental inability to conceive of the true nature and spirit of Christianity than the above, giving expression to his amazement that Christians should be unwilling to pray for his destruction, and attributing their unwillingness to do so to fear of the consequences likely to fall on their

own heads. His one-sided duel with John Alexander Dowie¹ was widely quoted in the West, and although Dowie scorned to enter the lists with him, nevertheless, after Dowie's death, Aḥmad wondered why Christendom failed to acknowledge his own power, which had effected such a miracle, and, thenceforth, to accept him as its spiritual head. The following quotation from the *Review of Religions* (V, p. 459) gives a summary of Aḥmad's philosophy of prayer and its outcome:—"He (Aḥmad) has announced that whoever would pray for his death would himself fall a prey to a speedy and painful death, and that such a person would die before he dies. He has very often invited the world to test his truth by this criterion. Even if a host of men pray against him, they are sure, he says, to be consumed with the wrath of God in his life-time, for the mighty Hand of God is in his support, and every one who rises against him is sure to be knocked down. And there have been actually men who made a response to his call and prayed to God against him, but they all died as he prophesied, and thus furnished a proof of his truth. The names of those who wielded the sword of prayer against him, but cut their own throats with it, are as follows: Maulvī Ghulām Dastagīr, of Qasūr, District Lahore; Maulvī Muḥammad Ismail, of Aligarh; Pandit Lekh Ram, the well-known Ārya leader; Maulvī Muḥammad Ḥasan, of Bhin, District Jhelum; Faqīr Mirzā, of Dulunijal, District Jhelum; Chirāgh Dīn, of Jammu."

Aḥmad likewise made frequent prophecies of the rapid spread and ultimate triumph of his cause. He also prophesied the birth of sons for his friends, some of whom, it is reported, paid him liberally for his trouble. These prophecies, if we are to believe his enemies, very often

¹ Dowie (1847-1907), self-styled "First Apostle of the Lord Jesus, the Christ, and General Overseer of the Christian Apostolic Church in Zion," also "Elijah II" and "The Promised Messiah," established a religious commonwealth called "Zion City," on the shores of Lake Michigan, U.S.A., in 1901. In 1906 the city revolted against him, and he was finally suspended from the Church, charged with misuse of funds, tyranny and immorality.

failed of fulfilment. At times, for example, we find him seeking to explain in devious ways the non-appearance of the predicted boy or the appearance of "merely a girl," failures with which his enemies delighted to taunt him. One of Aḥmad's converts, Abdulla of Timapur, who afterward claimed to be himself the Messiah,¹ in a published reply to a pamphlet of Aḥmad's mentions the case of a certain Risaldar-Major, who gave the Mīrzā Šāhib Rs. 500 in return for the prophecy of a son who failed to materialize. He likewise writes of one, Fateh 'Alī Shāh, who asked for prayer for the recovery of his wife, who soon after passed away. He further states that Maulvī Muḥammad Husain, Aḥmad's inveterate opponent, received a grant of land from the Government soon after his immediately forthcoming discomfiture had been prophesied by Aḥmad.

Professor Sirāj-ud-Dīn, in an illuminating article on the Aḥmadiya movement published in 1907,² shows how a clever Muslim opponent of Aḥmad's answered in kind one species of characteristic Aḥmadiya challenge:

"One of the clever tricks used by the Mīrzā in connection with his prophetic business is to announce that 'if a certain prediction made by him against an opponent is not true, let his opponent come to Qādiān within so many days and swear the prediction has not been fulfilled, and if he does not come within the stated period it is proved that he is in the wrong and the prediction has come true!' Such challenges are often in their very nature unanswerable.

¹ Maulvī Abdulla of Timapur (a suburb of Shorapūr, in the Deccan) had been successively Sunnite Muslim, Wāhhābī, and Aḥmadi, before he created his own sect, declaring, "I am the man from God: You must all follow me. I am the real Khalīfa of Qādiān." He has about three hundred disciples at present, and is much more friendly to Christians than to Muslims. I am indebted for this information to Rev. N. Desai, the pastor of a self-supporting Indian Christian congregation at Shorapur.

² R. Sirāj-ud-Dīn, now professor of philosophy in Forman Christian College, Lahore, and an elder in the Presbyterian Church, spent several months with Aḥmad at Qādiān during the period when he was weighing the claims of Christianity. He has kept in close touch with the Aḥmadiya movement ever since, and the article from which we quote may be counted a primary source.

But sometimes he is paid by others in the same coin. A Muḥammadan maulvī, of Lahore, published a notice some time ago that he had prophesied a number of things about the Mīrzā which had all come true, *viz.*, that he shall not succeed in marrying a certain woman; that in a certain case a girl and not a boy shall be born, contrary to the Mīrzā's prophecy, etc., etc. Then he went on to say that his last prophecy about the Mīrzā was that he would become a leper, and that from people who had seen the Mīrzā he had learned that signs of leprosy had appeared on his body. He therefore challenged the Mīrzā to come to Lahore within a stated period, and show his body in public if it was free from leprosy, and if the Mīrzā did not come within that time, it would prove that he had certainly become a leper according to the Maulvī's prophecy. The Mīrzā, though ordinarily ready for an answer to everything, had no answer whatever to give."¹

The above are a few of the false prophecies that have been cited by Aḥmad's enemies.

At the time of the acute unrest in Bengal, due to the partition of the province,² Aḥmad prophesied, in February, 1906, "relating to the order that had been given concerning Bengal at first, they will be conciliated now" (*Review of Religions*, V, p. 82). After the excitement had somewhat subsided and the temporarily unpopular Lieutenant-Governor of the new province had resigned (long before the rearrangement of the partition), Aḥmad claimed that his prophecy had been fulfilled, and jubilantly queried :

"Could any one guess six months before the resignation of Sir B. Fuller that the Bengali agitators would be thus conciliated? There

¹ "Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad, a False Messiah of India," in *The Missionary Review of the World*, New Series, XX, pp. 754, 755.

² In 1905 a new province, of Eastern Bengal and Assam, was in part created out of a section of old Bengal, and there was a general realignment of boundaries in that part of India. The move was believed by the Hindu populace to be an attempt to weaken national, political and religious feeling, and proved so unpopular that in December, 1911, at the time of the King-Emperor's durbar in Delhi, announcement was made of a forthcoming rearrangement of the boundaries, whereby Eastern Bengal was to be re-united to Bengal proper in the present Bengal Presidency.

were, no doubt, men who hoped that a Liberal Government in England may set aside the order of partition, but no one ever thought of the conciliatory policy that has been adopted by the Government" (*Review of Religions*, V, p. 363).

Aḥmad did not live to learn that the agitation, which he then believed ended, was to continue, and that those who believed that the Liberal Government would rearrange the partition were finally proved to have been in the right. Had he done so, he would unquestionably have explained that it was only a more complete fulfilment of his original prophecy.¹

Aḥmad laid much stress on his ability to foresee the coming of earthquake and plague. On April 4th, 1905, a great earthquake occurred in North India. Out of the mass of his forgotten past prophecies he then produced one, of the date of December, 1903, which said, "A shock of earthquake"; and another, of May, 1904, which declared, "No trace shall be left of the abodes; both permanent and temporary abodes being laid waste." As no time or place was specified, and as it was even possible, if necessary or desirable, to allegorize the expected earthquake in some manner, it had no doubt seemed certain that the prophecies would prove convenient for reference at some later date. And so it happened, with the occurrence of the earthquake of 1905, when, referring to those prophecies, we find it written in the *Review of Religions*:

"No power in heaven or earth besides that of the Omniscient God could reveal such deep knowledge of the future."

This is a good illustration of what Dr. Griswold, four years previous, wrote of as "the Delphic ambiguity of his oracles, and also the way in which the indefinite is made definite *post eventum*."²

¹ Since writing the above words I have come upon an article in *Review of Religions* for May, 1916 (XV, p. 168), which deals with Aḥmad's various prophecies, and in which, in connection with "Aḥmad's Prophecy about Bengal," the announcement of the rearrangement of the partition, on 12th December, 1911, is given as marking the fulfilment of Aḥmad's prediction "to the very letter." "Conciliation," the author writes, "is predicted in the prophetic utterances, and the same is brought about."

² Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad, *The Mehdi Messiah of Qādiān*, p. 21.

Aḥmad himself was constrained to admit that his prophecies were open to criticism on the score of vagueness but he felt that the criticism was unjust, and complained: "Now that the thing has happened all these wonderful prophecies are ignored because it was not stated that on the 4th of April, in 1905, a severe shock of earthquake would be felt at 6.15 a.m., which would level the buildings with the ground in such and such cities situated in the Kangra district, that its crushing effect would also be felt in such and such other cities of the Panjab, and that the number of persons killed or buildings destroyed would be so much. What is the particular which was not foretold *with the exception only of the names and figures?*" (*Review of Religions*, IV, p. 230). The italics are ours.

The *Review of Religions* for December, 1915, gives a typical summary of some of the fulfilled prophecies of Aḥmad, conveying the impression that these events were predicted definitely and in detail, whereas in not a single instance, probably (if we except the case of Dr. Dowie, whose coming downfall was evident to thousands), was this the case:

"He (Aḥmad) published hundreds of prophecies, many of which have already come true (such as his prophecy regarding the Partition of Bengal, the defeat of Russia and the annexation of Korea by Japan, the Persian Revolution, the outbreak of plague in India, the occurrence of earthquakes of unparalleled severity in diverse parts of the earth, the defeat of Turks in Thrace and their subsequent victory over the Bulgarians, the downfall and death of Dr. Dowie, the false prophet of America, etc., etc.) and many still await fulfilment."

The great plague, which raged continuously in the Panjab for many years before the death of the prophet, was a further example of the same principle. This was held to be not only a general fulfilment of prophecies of Jesus, Muḥammad and Aḥmad, referring to the Last Day, and a warning to men everywhere to recognize the promised Messiah's claims (*Review of Religions*, VI, p. 251), but it evoked a more detailed prophecy of Aḥmad's, to the effect that God would protect from the

scourge the followers of Aḥmad, the village of Qādiān, and especially the house of Aḥmad. Regarding inoculation for the plague, he wrote in 1902 (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 417) :

“ It should be borne in mind that I do not declare it to be generally illegal to have recourse to medicines or preventive measures in the case of plague or other diseases, for the Holy Prophet is reported to have said that there is no malady for which God has not created a remedy. But I consider it sinful to obscure by inoculation the heavenly sign which God has been gracious enough to display for me and my followers, and by which he intends to show his distinctive favour to those who accept me in sincerity and faithfulness. I cannot, therefore, insult and discredit this sign of mercy by submitting to inoculation, and be guilty of unbelief in the promise of God.”

When the plague eventually reached Qādiān, and struck down, indiscriminately, both enemies and followers of Aḥmad, explanations were in order and were forthcoming :

“ The occasional occurrence of plague among my people without causing any considerable loss cannot lessen the value of the heavenly signs, for we witness in the history of early prophets that it was only their ultimate success that served as a heavenly sign, although in the meantime they occasionally suffered loss, which, being insignificant, could not mar their progress ” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 418).

It was also pointed out that prophecy had not said that Qādiān would escape the plague, but that it would receive protection, which meant that it would not be utterly desolated as some other towns had been.

III. THE INCARNATION OF KṚṢṆA

On November 1st, 1904, in an address at Sialkot, Aḥmad made the first public announcement of his being the *burūz* (spiritual manifestation), or, in the Hindu language, the *avatār* (incarnation), of Kṛṣṇa, as well as, in some sense, of Muḥammad and Christ, although he then claimed that he had been addressed as Kṛṣṇa in one of his earlier revelations :

“ He has told me, not on one occasion but repeatedly, that so I am Kṛṣṇa for the Hindus and the Promised Messiah for the Muḥammadans and the Christians. I know that ignorant Muḥammadans will at once exclaim, upon hearing this, that I have become a plain un-

believer and heretic on account of my having adopted the name of an unbeliever, as they think the Holy Kṛiṣṇa to be, but this is a revelation from God which I cannot but announce, and this is the first day that I announce this claim in such a large gathering, for those who come from God do not fear being blamed or reviled. Now Raja Kṛiṣṇa was revealed to me as so great and perfect a man that his equal is not to be found among the Hindu *Rishis*¹ and *avatārs*. . . . I love Kṛiṣṇa, for I appear as his image. . . . Spiritually, Kṛiṣṇa and the Promised Messiah are one and the same person, there being no difference except that which exists in the terminology of the two people, Hindu and Muḥammadan" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 411).

In the revelation Aḥmad was thus addressed: "It is not good to oppose the 'Brāhman Avatār'" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 411).

Hitherto Aḥmad, as the Promised Messiah, standing outside of the Hindu fold, had had much to say about Hindu weaknesses and faults. Now he occupied a new platform and spoke with a new voice. In the address from which I have quoted he reiterated many of his old objections to the Ārya Samāj, but he now prefixed to them the words: "As Kṛiṣṇa I now warn the Āryas of some of their errors." There is no evidence to show that Hindus and Āryas looked with any more favour upon Aḥmad after his unique pronouncement than before, but certainly his anticipations were realized in a further deepening of the animosity with which orthodox Islām regarded this *soi disant* champion of their faith.

Since Aḥmad's death one of his followers at Qādiān has had printed on the letterhead of his correspondence paper the following legend, which adds further claims not hitherto enunciated, and makes it clear that present-day followers of Aḥmad believe that every prophecy of any religion that anticipates the coming upon earth of a great spiritual leader has been fulfilled in the person of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān. This reads as follows:

"Praised be Allah, the Almighty, the Gracious, the Merciful, one worshipable God, Sustainer of all; who through his kindness raised a prophet in these days like unto the prophets of old days, *viz.*, 'AḤMAD,' the Promised Messiah, the Muḥammadan Meḥdī, the Kṛiṣṇa, the latter day Reformer of Parsees, the Hope of all the

¹ Cf. p. 105, Note 1.

nations of the day—Champion of Islām, Reformer of Christianity, Avatār of Hinduism, Buddha of East—blessed are they who believe in him, and take shelter under his peaceful banner, now held by his second successor, the promised son, His Hazrat ‘Maḥmūd,’ to whom all correspondence should be addressed on the subjects of : Existence and Unity of God, the divine message of the greatest of the Prophets, ‘Muhammad’ (on whom be peace and blessings), truth of Islām, Jesus’ Tomb in Kashmir, Second Advent of the Messiah at Qādiān, Ahmadiya Movement, etc.”

CHAPTER III

THE AḤMADIYA MOVEMENT AND ORTHODOX ISLĀM

AḤMAD was ever boasting of his uncompromising orthodoxy. If he departed from the beliefs of a majority of his co-religionists on some points, it was only because they had themselves failed rightly to understand the original purport of Islām. He was sent to correct their errors and once more give them the true guidance. Aḥmad and his followers may be held to represent the analogue in Islām of that school of Christians who will brook no study of comparative religions, because they hold that there is but one religion, incomparably sublime. In the year 1903 Aḥmad received a letter from a religious liberal in America, who wrote that every religion contains some truth and some falsehood—being but the radius of a circle whose centre is God. This creed, which Bahā'Ullah¹ would doubtless have applauded, Aḥmad spurned. He was glad that his correspondent had been led to see the folly and falsehood of Christianity, but regretted that he had not studied Islām and so discovered that it "is the only religion which not only claims to be free from every error and falsehood, but also offers proof of this freedom from error, no other religion on the face of the earth satisfying either of these requisites" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 29). Two years later a writer in the *Review of Religions* commented on some remarks by Rev. E. W. Thompson, M.A., in the *London Quarterly Review*, to the effect that "in India

¹ Bahā'Ullah (1817-1892) was the founder of the Persian sect known as the Bahā'is, an outgrowth of Bābism. It claims to be the universal religion of brotherhood and peace.

there are elements of positive worth, not merely of curious interest, which the Christian missionary can accept thankfully, and use in the building up of the fabric of the Christian Church and nation" (*Review of Religions* IV, p. 317). Aḥmad's editor asserts: "This statement involves an admission that Christianity is not a perfect religion in itself. The superiority of Islām lies in this, that while it has from the beginning preached that every religion was founded on truth and that errors found their way into it later on, it has at the same time taught that it is a perfect religion, and that there is no religious truth which is not to be met with in it. Such a perfection can not be claimed by any religion besides Islām" (*Review of Religions*, IV, p. 318).

The unique inspiration of the Qur'ān is, of course, an integral element in this perfection.

"The Holy Qur'ān is, in fact, the only book which asserts that every word of it came from an eternal higher source, and that the Prophet only dictated what he heard. Other inspired books claim to be inspired only in the sense that they were infused into the mind of the writer, while the Qur'ān was not infused into the mind, but rehearsed before the Prophet by the Angel Gabriel, and then repeated by the Prophet exactly as he heard it" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 277).

Nevertheless the Qur'ān while inspired must not be considered devoid of reason, enforcing its precepts simply on the basis of their origin :

"In connection with these remarks it should be borne in mind that the truth of the Holy Qur'ān does not depend merely on its uninterrupted transmission and authenticity, for it proceeds on the argumentative line. It does not compel us to accept its doctrines, principles, and commandments simply on the authority of revelation, but appeals to reason in man and gives arguments for what it inculcates" (*Teachings of Islām*, pp. 171, 172).

And in another place Aḥmad writes, contrasting the Bible and the Qur'ān: "The Bible is a collection of myths and stories and fables and idle tales, fit for women only, whereas the Qur'ān is pure philosophy, free from myths and fables."

On the subject of divine inspiration, as distinguished from the human inspiration of genius, Aḥmad stated his position as follows :

“Before proceeding further it is necessary to remove a misconception regarding *Ilhām*¹ (inspiration). *Ilhām* does not mean that an idea is infused into the mind of a person who sets himself to think about a thing. A mere poet is not inspired, in the theological sense, when brilliant ideas flash upon him as he sits down to make verses. In this case there is no distinction between good and bad. When the mental powers are applied to a subject, new ideas will flash upon the mind according to the genius of the thinker and without any regard to the good or bad nature of the subject. If the word, *Ilhām*, is taken to mean the occurring on a particular occasion of new ideas, a thief or a dacoit or a murderer may as well be called *Mulhām* (the inspired one of God) on account of the ingenious plans which suggest themselves to his mischief-making mind for the perpetration of evil deeds. Such a view of *Ilhām* (inspiration) is held by men who are quite ignorant of the true God, who with his word gives peace and consolation to hearts and knowledge of spiritual truths to those who are not aware of them. What is *Ilhām* (inspiration) then? It is the living and powerful Word of God in which he speaks to or addresses one of his servants whom he has chosen, or intends to choose, from among all people. When such conversation or utterances run on continually in a regular method, not being insufficient or fragmentary or enveloped in the darkness of evil ideas, and have a heavenly bliss, wisdom and power in them, they are the Word of God with which he comforts his servant and reveals himself to him” (*Teachings of Islām*, pp. 177, 178).

He then proceeds in the passage following to read himself into the select class of recipients of minor inspiration. Although he claimed to be a prophet, with evidentiary miracles, he made no claim to *wahy*, so far as I can discover. He avoided running counter to the universal Muslim belief that Muḥammad was “the last of the prophets and the seal of the prophets” by asserting that his prophetship was not in its own right, but in and through Muḥammad, in whose spirit and power he had come.²

¹ Islām knows of two forms of divine inspiration—*wahy*, major inspiration, granted to the prophets; and *ilhām*, minor inspiration, granted to the saints generally—by means of which knowledge comes into their minds through direct illumination, as opposed to that which comes through study and deduction.

Cf. Macdonald: *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islām*, Chicago, 1909, p. 252ff. For an excellent summary of the orthodox position, see article by Macdonald on “The Doctrine of Revelation in Islām,” in *Moslem World*, VII, p. 112.

² Cf. p. 37.

Of Muḥammad we are told, as we should expect, that he "spoke not a word of himself, but only that which he heard from God" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 277). Not only was Muḥammad's utterance inspired, but his life was sinless¹ as well. All sins imputed to him by Christian writers Aḥmad attempted to refute, including his marriage to Zainab, the divorced wife of Zaid, which Aḥmad defended, and the so-called "lapse of Muḥammad"² or "compromise with idolatry," found in a number of traditions, which Aḥmad denied *in toto*. Muḥammad is variously referred to as a true Saviour, an Intercessor, a miracle-worker, and a perfect manifestation of the Divine Being.

Aḥmad held that the *sunna*³ was given with the Qur'ān for the guidance of mankind. The traditions, he wrote, can be believed because of the unequalled "pains taken by Muḥammadan writers in ascertaining the true facts of the Holy Prophet's life, and in sifting the traditional lore" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 449). Some variations are admitted, but

"Traditions cannot be divested of their authority, and the historical value they possess, by the mere consideration that even the minute scrutiny of early collectors may not have freed them from every error, while their authenticity can be further tested by the consideration that no authentic tradition can contradict the Holy Qur'ān" (*Review of Religions*, III, pp. 449, 450).

It must be added that a further test of the authenticity of any tradition in Aḥmad's eyes was that it should not contradict the particular interpretation of Islām for which the "promised Messiah" claimed divine sanction in our day.

¹ Cf. p. 81, Note 1.

² After Qur'ān LIII, 20, where several Arabian idols are mentioned, tradition says that at the first recital of the Qur'ān Muḥammad added, hoping to win the Meccans by this compromise, "These are the exalted females, and verily their intercessions may be expected." This is one of the verses that were later abrogated and do not now appear. For the original traditions in which the story appears, see Goldsack, *Muḥammad in Islām*, Madras, 1916, pp. 48-52.

³ That is, the custom or usage of the Prophet which has been handed down for the guidance of the Muslim people in the traditions. Each tradition (*ḥadīs*) contains a *sunna*, a narrative of what the Prophet said or did or did not do on a certain occasion.

Aḥmad and his followers have subscribed to the five pillars (*arkān*) of Islām, as is indicated in a lecture on "Fundamental Doctrines of the Muslim Faith,"¹ delivered in December, 1906, at the annual gathering of the *Ṣadr Anjuman-i-Aḥmadiya*,² and we are pleased to note that he taught a spiritual and ethical rather than a mechanical and literal obedience to the law. He was unsparing in his condemnation of those orthodox Muslims of whose performance of their religious duties he writes :

"In short, though there are some people who still carry out some of the precepts of *Shari'at* (religious law), they do it in a way that their actions fail to produce the effect which ought to have been produced. Their *Namāz*, their *Roza*, their *Zakāt* and their *Hajj* are just the kind of actions performed by players, one of whom sometimes assumes the rôle of king and takes his seat and holds his court, though actually he is a beggar. . . . This worship of theirs has no value in the sight of God" (*Review of Religions*, XIV, p. 449).

Regarding *Shahādat*, the verbal witness of the Muslim to the unity of God and the prophetship of Muḥammad, Aḥmad denied that

"The utterance of the above-mentioned words with the tongue is sufficient for the attainment of salvation";

and he continued :

"Almighty God sees the hearts and mere words have no importance in his sight. . . . The realization of the signification of these words involves that a man should have no object of love besides God, nor any object of worship or desire besides him" (*Review of Religions*, VI, p. 25).

Similarly of *Salāt* or *Namāz*, the Muslim worship prescribed five times daily, he wrote :

"The utterance of certain words with the lips is not prayer. It is a necessary condition for the acceptance of prayer that the heart should completely melt before God, and the grace of God should be taught with patience and perseverance. . . . All the movements in prayers are expressive of the deepest humbleness before God" (*Review of Religions*, VI, 28).

¹ This lecture first appeared in sections in *Review of Religions* in 1907, and afterward was published by Luzac & Company, London, in 1910, under the caption, *The Teachings of Islām*, from which quotations have already been made.

² "Chief Aḥmadiya Society," founded before Aḥmad's death in accordance with instructions contained in his will, the contents of which were made known in 1905. See p. 113

Of the third pillar, *saum*, or fasting during the month of Ramaḍān, he said :

“ Fasting is necessary for the perfect purity of the soul. . . . The fact is that the suffering of hunger and reducing the quantity of food which one generally takes is an essential step in the spiritual progress of man. . . . Man does not live by bread alone.¹ . . . The man who fasts should bear in mind that fasting does not mean only abstaining from food for a stated time. Its true significance is that man should abstain from every kind of evil ” (*Review of Religions*, VI, p. 30).

Regarding *Zakāt*, or almsgiving, he held that

“ What Islām aims at teaching by this institution is that a man should not so love the wealth of this world as to feel it difficult to part with it in the way of God ” (*Review of Religions*, VI, p. 31).

The fifth pillar, the pilgrimage to Mecca (*Hajj*),

“ Represents the last stage for the spiritual wayfarer,” when he “ has all his lower connections entirely cut off and he is completely engrossed with Divine love. The true lover finds his highest satisfaction in sacrificing his very heart and soul for the beloved one’s sake, and the circuit round the house of God is an emblem of external manifestation of it ” (*Review of Religions*, VI, pp. 31-32).

It might be noted here that Aḥmad himself never made the pilgrimage to Mecca, perhaps because of his poor health.

At this point a few further quotations from *The Teachings of Islām* may be in order, showing, like those just given, a spiritualized treatment of Qur’ānic verses that is more akin to the interpretations of the Ṣūfis (the Muslim mystics) than to those of the orthodox commentators.

With regard to the sources of man’s threefold nature (physical, moral and spiritual) he declared :

“ To return to the subject in hand, as I have already stated, there are three sources which give rise to the threefold nature of man, *viz.*, the disobedient soul, the self-accusing soul, and the soul at rest.²

¹ This quotation from Jesus’ words in the temptation in the wilderness (Matt. 4 : 4) is interesting here.

² For a statement of the Ṣūfī teaching regarding the three states of the soul referred to in Qur’ān, XII, 53; LXXV, 2; and LXXXIX, 27, respectively, see Macdonald, *The Religious Attitude and Life in Islām* pp. 229, 230.

Accordingly there are three stages of reformation, answering respectively to the three sources. In the first stage we are concerned with mere ignorant savages, whom it is our duty to raise to the status of civilised men by teaching them the social laws relating to their daily mutual relations. The first step toward civilization, therefore, consists in teaching the savage not to walk about naked, or devour carcases, or indulge in other barbarous habits. This is the lowest grade in the reformation of man. In humanizing people upon whom no ray of the light of civilization has yet fallen, it is necessary, first of all, to take them through this stage and make them accustomed to morals of the lowest type. When the savage has learned the crude manners of society, he is prepared for the second stage of reformation. He is then taught the high and excellent moral qualities pertaining to humanity, as well as the proper use of his own faculties and of whatever lies hidden beneath them. Those who have acquired excellent morals are now prepared for the third stage, and, after they have attained to outward perfection, are made to taste of union with, and the love of, God. These are the three stages which the Holy Qur'ān has described as necessary for any wayfarer who travels in the path of God'' (*The Teachings of Islām*, pp. 19, 20).

Of the third stage, "the soul at rest," regarding which so many Ṣūfī treatises have been written, he had this to say, in part :

"We have already stated in the beginning of this discourse that the source of the spiritual conditions is the soul at rest which takes a man onward in his moral progress and makes him godly ; in other words, transports him from the moral to the spiritual regions. Upon this topic the following verse has a plain bearing : 'O thou soul ! that art at rest and retest fully contented with thy Lord, return unto him, he being pleased with thee and thou with him ; so enter among my servants and enter into my Paradise !' (LXXXIX, 28, 30). In discussing the spiritual conditions, it is necessary to comment upon this verse in some detail. It should be borne in mind that the highest spiritual condition to which man can aspire in this world is that he should rest contented with God and find his quietude, his happiness and his delight in him alone. This is the stage of life which we term the heavenly life. The pure and perfect sincerity, truth and righteousness of a person are rewarded by Almighty God by granting him a heaven upon this earth. All others look to a prospective paradise but he enters paradise in this very life. It is at this stage, too, that a person realizes that the prayers and worship, which at first appeared to him as a burden, are really a nourishment on which the growth of his soul depends, and that this is the basis of his spiritual development. He then sees that the fruit of his efforts is not to be reaped in a future life only. The spirit, which, in the second stage, although blaming a man for the impurities of life, was yet powerless to resist the evil tendencies or to blot them out wholly and too infirm to establish a man upon the principle of virtue with firmness, now

reaches a stage of development in which its efforts are crowned with success. The sensual passions die out of themselves and the soul no more stumbles but, strengthened with the Spirit of God, it is ashamed of its past failings. The state of struggle with evil propensities passes away; an entire change passes over the nature of man and the former habits undergo a complete transformation. He is perfectly estranged from his former courses of life. He is washed of all impurities and perfectly cleansed. God himself plants the love of virtue in his heart and purifies it of the defilement of evil with his own hand. The hosts of truth encamp in his heart and righteousness controls all the towers of his heart. Truth is victorious and falsehood lays down its arms and is reduced to subjection. The hand of God sways over his heart and he walks every step under his shelter" (*The Teachings of Islām*, pp. 96-98).

In order to the realisation of perfect union with God two means are given:

"Returning to the main point of the subject under discussion, the Holy Qur'ān has taught us two means for a perfect spiritual union with God, *viz.*, complete resignation to the will of God, which is known by the name of *Islām*, and constant prayers and supplications, as taught in the opening *sura* of Al-Qur'ān, known by the name of *fatīha*.¹ The essence of the religious code of Muḥammadism is contained in *Islām* and the *fatīha*. These are two channels which lead to the fountain of salvation and the only safe guides which lead us to God" (*The Teachings of Islām*, p. 118).

Aḥmad's conception of the life after death accepts and improves on the most advanced spiritual interpretations that we have seen elsewhere of the passages of the Qur'ān referring to the hereafter. Numerous echoes of New Testament verses and teachings can be noted. Somewhat fuller quotations are needed here:

"From the manner in which internal conditions are represented in physical forms in dreams we can form an idea of the embodiment of the spiritual conditions of this world in the life to come. After our earthly course is ended, we are translated to regions where our deeds and their consequences assume a shape, and what is hidden in us in this world is there unrolled and laid open before us. These embodiments of spiritual facts are substantial realities, as, even in dreams, though the sight soon vanishes away, yet so long as it is before our eyes, it is taken to be a reality. As this representation by images is a new and a perfect manifestation of the power of God, we may as well call it, not a representation of certain facts, but actually a new creation brought

¹ Cf. p. 41, Note 2.

about by the powerful hand of God. With reference to this point, Almighty God says in the Holy Qur'ān : 'No soul that worketh good knoweth the blessings and joys which have been kept secret for it' (XXXII, 17), to be disclosed after death. Thus Almighty God describes the heavenly blessings that the righteous shall enjoy in the next life as having been kept secret because, not being like anything contained in this world, no one knows aught about them. It is evident that the things of this world are not a secret to us; we not only know pomegranates, dates, milk, etc., but frequently taste of them. These things, therefore, could not be called secrets. The fruits of paradise have, therefore, nothing in common with these except the name. He is perfectly ignorant of the Holy Qur'ān who takes paradise for a place where only the things of this world are provided in abundance. In explanation of the verse quoted above, the Holy Prophet said that heaven and its blessings are things which 'the eye hath not seen, nor hath ear heard, nor hath it entered into the heart of man to conceive of them.'¹ But of the things of this world we cannot say that our eyes have not seen them, or that our ears have not heard them, or that our minds have not conceived them. When God and his Prophet tell us of things in heaven which our senses are not cognizant of in this world, we should be guilty of cherishing doctrines against the teachings of the Holy Qur'ān if we supposed rivers flowing with the milk which we ordinarily drink here. Can we, moreover, consistently with the idea of heaven, suppose flocks of cows and buffaloes reared in the paradisiac grounds and numerous honeycombs hanging on trees with countless bees busily engaged in collecting honey and hosts of angels engaged day and night in milking cows and getting honey and pouring them continuously into streams to keep them running on? Are these ideas in keeping with the teachings of the verses which tell us that this world is a stranger to the blessings of the next world? Will these things illumine the soul or increase the knowledge of God or afford spiritual food as the heavenly blessings are described to do? It is, no doubt, that these blessings are represented as material things, but we are also told that their source is spirituality and righteousness'' (*The Teachings of Islām*, p. 122ff).

"Whatever the good men enjoy spiritually in this life are really blessings not of this but of the next life, and are granted to them as a specimen of the bliss that is in store for them in the next life in order to increase their yearning for it. It should, moreover, be borne in mind that the truly righteous man is not of this world, and hence he is also hated by the world. He is of heaven and is granted heavenly blessings, just as the worldly ones are granted the dainties of this world. The blessings which are granted him are really hidden from the eyes, the ears and the hearts of men of the world, and they are quite strangers to them. But the person whose physical life is annihilated in the heavenly enjoyments is made spiritually to taste of the cup which he shall actually quaff in the next world, and hence the truth of the words:

¹ Corinthians 2: 9.

'These were the fruits which were given us formerly.' But he shall at the same time be perfectly aware that those blessings were quite unknown to the world, and as he too was *in* this world, though not *of* this world, so he also shall bear witness that his physical eye never saw such blessings, nor his ear ever heard of them, nor his mind ever conceived of them in the world" (*The Teachings of Islām*, p. 127).

"It should also be borne in mind that the Holy Qur'ān describes three worlds or three different states of man's life. The first world is the present one, which is called the world of earning and of the first creation. It is here that man earns a reward for the good or bad deeds he does. Although there are stages of advancement for the good after resurrection, yet that advancement is granted simply by the grace of God, and does not depend upon human efforts.

"The second world is called *barzakh*.¹ The word originally means any intermediate state. As this world falls between the present life and resurrection, it has been called *barzakh*. But this word has from time immemorial been applied to an intermediate state, and thus the word itself is a standing witness to the intermediate state between death and after life. . . . The state of *barzakh* is that in which the soul leaves the mortal body and the perishable remains are decomposed. The body is thrown into a pit, and the soul also is, as it were, thrown down into some pit, because it loses the power to do good or bad deeds along with its loss of control over the body. It is evident that a good state of the soul is dependent upon the soundness of the body. A shock communicated to a particular point of the brain causes a loss of memory, while an injury to another part is certain to deal a death-blow to the reasoning faculty and may destroy even consciousness. Similarly a convulsion of the brain muscles or a hemorrhage or morbidity of the brain may, by causing obstruction, lead to insensibility, epilepsy or cerebral apoplexy. Experience, therefore, establishes the fact beyond all reasonable doubt that with all its connections severed from the body the soul can serve no purpose. It is simply idle to assert that the human soul can, at any time, enjoy a bliss without having any connection with a body. . . . Now if the soul is unable to make any advancement in this brief life without the assistance of the body, how could it, without a body, attain to the higher stages of advancement in the next life?

"In short, various arguments prove conclusively that, according to the Islāmic principles, the perfection of the soul depends upon its permanent connection with a body. There is no doubt that after death this body of clay is severed from the soul, but then in the *barzakh* every soul receives temporarily a new body to be in a position to taste of the reward or punishment of its deeds. This new body is not a body of clay, but a bright or a dark body prepared from the actions of this life. Such is the Qur'ānic description of the body in the *barzakh*, viz., that the soul has a new body, which is bright or dark according to the good or bad actions which a man performs. It may appear as a

¹ The verse of the Qur'ān (XXIII, 102) in which this word appears is the source of the Muslim conception of an intermediate state,

mystery to some, but this much at least must be admitted, that it is not unreasonable. The perfect man realises the preparation of such a bright body even in this life. - Ordinary human understanding may call it a mystery which is beyond human comprehension, but those who have a keen and bright spiritual sight will have no difficulty in realizing the truth of a bright or a dark body after death prepared from actions in this life. In short, the new body granted in the *barzakh* becomes the means of the reward of good or evil. I have personal experience in this matter. Many a time, when fully awake, I have seen visions in which I saw those who were dead. I have seen many an evil-doer and a wicked person with a body quite dark and smoky. I have personal acquaintance with these matters, and I assert it forcibly that, as Almighty God has said, every one is granted a body, either transparent or dark. . . .

"The third world is the world of resurrection. In this world every soul, good or bad, virtuous or wicked, shall be given a visible body. The day of resurrection is the day of the complete manifestation of God's glory, when every one shall become perfectly aware of the existence of God. On that day every person shall have a complete and open reward of his actions. How this can be brought about is not a matter to wonder at, for God is all-powerful and nothing is impossible with him" (*The Teachings of Islām*, pp. 131-136).

"The third point of importance that the Holy Qur'ān has described in connection with the life after death, is that the progress that can be made in that world is infinite. The word of God says: 'Those who have the light of faith in this world shall have their light on the day of judgment running before them and on their right hands, and they shall be continually saying: "O Lord, perfect our light and take us in thy protection, for thou hast power over all things"' (LXVI, 8). This unceasing desire for perfection shows clearly that progress in paradise shall be endless. For when they shall have attained one excellence they shall not stop there, and seeing a higher stage of excellence shall consider that to which they shall have attained as imperfect and shall, therefore, desire the attainment of the higher excellence. When they shall have attained to this they shall yet see another higher excellence, and thus they shall continue to pray for the attainment of higher and higher excellences." This ceaseless desire for perfection shows that they shall be endlessly attaining to excellences (*The Teachings of Islām*, pp. 142, 143).

"In short, heaven and hell, according to the Holy Qur'ān, are images and representations of a man's own spiritual life in this world. They are not new material worlds which come from outside. It is true that they shall be visible and palpable, call them material if you please, but they are only embodiments of the spiritual facts of this world. We call them material not in the sense that there shall be trees planted in the paradisiacal fields just like those that are planted here below, and that there shall be brimstones and sulphur in hell, but in the sense that we shall then find the embodiments of the spiritual facts of this life. Heaven and hell, according to Muslim belief, are the images of the actions which we perform here below" (*The Teachings of Islām*, pp. 144, 145).

One is irresistably reminded in reading the last passage of Fitzgerald's translation of the familiar quatrains, LXVI and LXVII, of the *Rubā'iyāt* of Omar Khayyām:¹

" I sent my Soul through the Invisible,
Some letter of that After-life to spell :
And by and by my soul returned to me,
And answer'd, ' I myself am Heav'n and Hell ':

" Heav'n but the Vision of fulfill'd Desire,
And Hell the Shadow from a Soul on fire,
Cast on the Darkness into which Ourselves,
So late emerged from, shall so soon expire."

As was to be expected, Aḥmad had no patience with the newer school of thinkers and writers in Islām who have abated somewhat the earlier claim of Islām to miraculous perfection and originality. The Right Hon. Syed Amīr 'Alī, the distinguished jurist and apologist of Islām, now living in London, and S. Khudā Baksh, M.A., an Oxford graduate and former professor in Presidency College, Calcutta, are scholarly enough to admit that the sources of Islām can largely be traced in the older religions of the world, so many of which were represented in pre-Islāmic Arabia:² and especially in Judaism and Christianity. Aḥmad, by *a priori* reasoning, declared this to have been impossible, whatever certain scholars may say :

" The Christians have spent too much time and labour, and they have spent it in vain, in showing that such and such a story in the Holy Qur'ān corresponds with another found in an earlier Jewish or Christian writing. The sources of Islām are not determined by any alleged correspondence, but by the effect which its teachings had. If the Jewish and Christian writings were the source from which Islāmic teachings and principles had been taken, their effect should have been at any rate inferior to that of the originals from which they were taken. But the inability of Jewish and Christian teachings to bring about a pure transformation in the lives of a people whom Islām, only within a few years, changed so entirely is a conclusive proof that the source of

¹ Edition of Edward Heron-Allen, London, 1899, pp. 98, 100.

² Cf. Syed Amīr 'Alī, *The Spirit of Islām*, Lahiri & Co., Calcutta, 1902, Introduction, p. lix ; and S. Khudā Baksh, M.A., *Essays Indian and Islāmic*, Probsthain & Co., London, 1912, p. 10. The chief religions from which Muḥammad borrowed were Christianity, Judaism, Zoroastrianism, Sabæanism and the pagan religion of Arabia. This subject is treated at length in W. St. Clair Tisdall, *The Original Sources of the Qur'ān*, London, 1905.

Islām was far purer and higher than the Jewish and Christian writings" (*Review of Religions*, IV, pp. 272, 273).

The alleged benighted condition of pre-Islāmic Arabia and the marvellous transformation wrought by Islām in every department of life is a frequent subject of Aḥmad's enthusiastic comment.

"The Arabs were then in such a degraded state that they could hardly be called men. There was no evil but was to be found in them, and there was no form of *shirk*¹ but prevailed among them. Thieving and dacoity formed their business, and the murder of a human being was with them like the trampling under foot of an ant. They killed orphans to appropriate their property, and buried their daughters alive under the ground. They took pride in adultery and openly spoke of indecent things in their poems, which were immoral in the highest degree. Drinking prevailed to such an extent that no house was free from it, and in gambling they beat every other people. In short, they were a disgrace even to the beasts and snakes of the desert.

"But when the Holy Prophet rose to regenerate these people, and when he devoted his whole attention to the purifying of their hearts and cast his holy influence on them, he worked such a transformation among them in a few days that from their savage stage they rose to be men, and from the stage of men they advanced to the stage of civilization, and thus progressing step by step they became godly men and finally they were so annihilated in the love of God that they bore every pain with the utmost resignation"² (*Review of Religions*, VII, pp. 264, 265).

He takes sharp issue with the rationalistic school of Muḥammadans who seek to account for Muḥammad and his revelation on other than supernatural grounds. After saying that unprejudiced European scholars are bound to recognize in Muḥammad "a great and wise Reformer and the noble benefactor of mankind" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 311), he proceeds,

"But even the *Mu'tazilite*, author of the *Spirit of Islām*³ and

¹ Cf. p. 41, Note I.

² Reference to any authentic history of the period will show how Aḥmad has distorted facts in this extreme statement.

³ Syed Amīr 'Alī admits his sympathy with the position of the *Mu'tazilite* (free-thinking) wing of Islām, which gives reason a place beside tradition and revelation, and makes man the author of his own actions (See his *The Spirit of Islām*, p. 321, and Macdonald, *The Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory*, New York, 1903, Part III, Chap. 1, p. 119ff.

the founder of the Aligarh College,¹ could go no further, nor see deeper into the facts, for they had no assurance of the open voice of God and his clear word, of a superhuman power and of an external revelation that did not proceed from the human heart" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 311).

And since it was a part of his creed that early Muslim society was far more perfect than that of to-day, he held in abhorrence the teaching of modern Muḥammadan exponents of Islām, who recognize that polygamy was and is an evil, but hold that since it was an improvement on former practices in Arabia, and therefore a step upward for the early Muslims, Muḥammad was justified in making it a part of Islām at that time, whereas Muslims to-day may not at all be justified in adhering to a custom that is inferior to the higher ideal of monogamy.² Aḥmad, while he was bound to admit that polygamy was more nearly universal among early Muslims than to-day, argued that the fact was due to the early wars against the enemies of Islām, by reason of which "the Muslim society was cut off from their kith and kin and there could not be inter-marriage between the Muslims and the unbelievers" (*Review of Religions*, IV, p. 145). Hence polygamy prevailed to a greater extent than to-day, as a matter of justice to the women of Islām. And we read further :

"In the matter of ignoring these circumstances, not only are those Muslims to blame who, like Mr. Amīr 'Alī and Mr. Dilāwar Husain, both of whom belong to the Shia sect, look upon polygamy as an evil, but even those cannot be acquitted of the charge who, while defending polygamy as an institution needful for human society, like the late Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān, have still expressed pleasure because it is less frequently practiced now, as if the early Muslims practiced it without any lawful necessity" (*Review of Religions*, IV, p. 145).

Aḥmad's contention is that polygamy should be contrasted not with monogamy but with celibacy. Replying

¹ Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān (1817-1898)—the progressive Indian Muslim who founded in 1875 the Muḥammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh, U.P., and, in 1886, the Muḥammadan Educational Conference. He was a thorough-going rationalist, and sought to accommodate Islām to modern ideas and Western education. See also pp. 133, 134.

² See *The Spirit of Islām*, p. 192, and *Essays Indian and Islāmic* p. 231.

to Mr. Dilāwar Husain, a vigorous champion of monogamy in Islām, the *Review of Religions* says :

“ He should bear in mind that according to Islām monogamy is the rule, while polygamy and celibacy are two necessary exceptions, which, if prohibited, must bring about great mischief. If he has got any reason to attack this position, he is welcome to the discussion, but if he has got nothing but to repeat the old stories of Mr. Amīr ‘Alī and others, he should better assume silence ” (*Review of Religions*, IV, p. 174).

One cannot help feeling that Aḥmad’s interest in this question of the existence of the supernatural over against a rigid rationalism had a somewhat personal bearing. If Muḥammad’s revelation in the seventh century was not to be considered supernatural to-day, there was little likelihood of any widespread recognition of the validity of Aḥmad’s claim in the twentieth century. To the Muḥammadan Educational Conference, the Muḥammadan College at Aligarh, the All-India Moslem League,¹ the Nadwat-ul-Ulama,² and all such “ Muḥammadan Revival Associations,” as he termed them, Aḥmad was unceasingly hostile. One of his followers asks pertinently :

“ Where is the living model whose example we must imitate ? ” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 321). . . . “ I ask the Nadwa which view of Islām is it going to offer to Europe ? Is it Islām in the light in which the late Sir Syed Aḥmad took it, which represents God as worthless and idle, denies revelation, the efficacy of prayer, angels, prophecy and supernatural signs, and describes the Holy Qur’ān as a dry book devoid of the miraculous ? ” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 329).

Other views of these “ Advanced Muḥammadans,” which Aḥmad repudiates, were the abolition of *pardah*,³ the modification of rules regarding prayers, fasting, alms,

Cf. p. 136.

² “ Council of the Learned,” an association of educated maulvīs in North India, whose chief undertaking has been the carrying on of a theological seminary for the training of a new school of enlightened Muḥammadan priests. Its headquarters are in Lucknow.

³ The Urdu word for “ curtain,” used in India of the institution of “ the veil ” imposed upon Muslim women by the “ Agreement ” (*ijmā’*) of the Muḥammadan community, and arising out of Muḥammad’s injunction, originally affecting his own wives, in Qur’ān, XXIV, 32. It enjoins that a woman may appear unveiled only in the presence of other women and of her husband and nearest male relations.

and pilgrimage, and the rejection of the later "Medina Sūras" of the Qur'ān. He strongly supported the Muslim prohibition of the drinking of intoxicants, and required of his followers abstention from tobacco smoking as well.

We shall see, when we come to consider Aḥmad's attitude towards Christianity, how staunchly he stood his ground on such moot points as divorce, the veil, and the ceremonial law of Islām, spurning any attempt within Islām to adapt Muḥammad's teaching and practice to present-day customs in Christian lands. Meantime, we must turn from his picture of an ideal Islām, believed to have been brought into the world by Muḥammad, to view the actual Islām which he saw around him, and which he unsparingly denounced.¹

Like the Jewish religion in the time of Jesus, he declared that Islām had become a religion of spiritless ceremonialism.

"I have come at a time when the Muḥammadan society has, like the Jewish, been rotten to the core, and spirituality, which is the life and essence, having departed, nothing has remained in the hands of the Muslims but the husk of lifeless ceremonies. . . ." (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 399).

In a letter written by Maulvī Abdul Karīm to the Nadwat-ul-Ulama, in reply to an invitation requesting the attendance of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad at its annual gathering at Calcutta, it was said :

"Forms and ceremonials have again got the upper hand, while the inner life, the essence of the law, the spirit that gave life to the form itself, is quite gone. Mosques and monasteries are full of bodies, but the soul is not there. . . . Divine commandments are set at naught, and the corruption of licentiousness, atheism and transgression is widespread" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 322).

As in the time of the pre-Islāmic Arabs, social and moral conditions are beyond description :

"It needs no demonstration to prove that Muḥammadan degeneration has passed all bounds, and that they are now standing on the verge of the pit of fire from which a blessed and mighty hand had

¹ For a frank and searching treatment of this subject by a recent writer of a different school, see *Essays Indian and Islāmic*, Chapter VII, "Thoughts on the Present Situation," p. 213ff.

drawn them back at first. The same dissensions and disputes, the same division in the camp, which marked the pre-Islāmic Arabs, is witnessed among those who claim to be following the banner of Islām. . . . Luxurious habits, transgressions, drunkenness, gambling and laziness, evils from which the mighty magnetizer had granted them a deliverance, have again the upper hand" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 318).

There is now no real enthusiasm for Islām, only ignorant superstition, which shows itself in slavish imitation of the Christian civilization of the West, on the part of some, and a blind worship of tombs and saints, on the part of others.

"There can be no denying the fact that the vast majority of Muḥammadans who claim to believe in the true God have really no faith at all" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 62).

"There is, no doubt, a great change in the object of superstition, but that is of little use. If the 'ignorant' Muḥammadans are to be blamed for an excessive reverence for tombs and miracles of saints, the 'advanced' Muḥammadans have a blind admiration for everything Western" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 441).

The condition of Muslims is such that followers of other creeds are alienated rather than attracted.

"Thus if there is any obstacle to the path of Islām it is the practical life of the Muslims themselves, and the sight of the same not only causes a repugnance in the followers of other creeds, but also alienates from Islām the feelings of the future generations of Muslims. The fact cannot be denied that in most Muslim families, it is to be found that the concern with religion is diminishing from father to son. Only a very small percentage of Musalmāns can be found who are sincerely convinced of the truth of Islām. In most cases religion has been left merely a matter of custom and habit" (*Review of Religions*, XIV, p. 453).

One cause of the decline of Islām and the deplorable social conditions among Muslim peoples is to be found in the forged traditions and *fatwās*¹ circulated by the maulvīs, for whom Aḥmad entertained no admiration.²

¹ See p. 16. A compilation of these *fatwās*, pronounced against Aḥmad, exists in Urdu.

² Maulvī Ilāhi Baksh, of Lahore, in his polemic against Aḥmad, *Asā'-i-Mūsa* ("Rod of Moses"), has given (pp. 143-146) an appalling alphabetical list of the abusive epithets applied to Muslim maulvīs by Aḥmad.

"We are commanded not to kill man, not to commit an outrage upon his honour, and not to seize his property dishonestly. But some Muḥammadans have broken all these commandments. They take away the life of an innocent person and never shudder at the inhumane deed. Empty-headed maulvies have circulated *fatwas* to the effect that it is lawful to seduce or seize the women of unbelievers or heretics, and to steal and misappropriate their properties. . . . The social relations of the Muslims are deplorable. Traditions have been fabricated that act like poison upon their moral conditions and break the Divine laws" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 23).

The present hard-heartedness of Muslims in their decline has led to a blood-thirstiness whose issue in Afghanistan was the murder of two followers of the Aḥmadiya faith.

"I think the chief reason of the decline of Muḥammadans is that the feelings of love and sympathy are on the wane in their hearts. I do not judge all Muḥammadans to be guilty of this hard-heartedness, but it cannot be denied that there are millions among them who are thirsty of the blood of their own kind" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 340).

We cannot vouch for the accuracy of the following description of the martyrdom of one of Aḥmad's followers in a purely Muḥammadan country. The parties referred to are Maulvī Abdul Latīf and the Amīr of Afghanistan :—

"When he refused to listen to all expostulations, the Amīr drew up the judgment with his own hands and caused it to be hung about his neck. He then ordered his nose to be bored, and a cord to be passed through the hole, by which he was drawn to the place of execution. While he was carried in this state of torture, he was mocked, abused and cursed. The Amīr with his Muftis and Maulvis watched and enjoyed this painful sight. When he was buried to his waist in earth the Amīr once more approached him and gave him promise of pardon on condition of his renunciation of his faith, but no words could tempt him to such a heinous deed as the renunciation of truth for the sake of a few days' comfort. Upon this there was again a tumult among the barbarous Qāzis and Muftis that he was a *Kāfir* (Unbeliever) and should be stoned to death without further delay. The Amīr then ordered the chief Qāzi to throw the first stone. The Qāzi requested the Amīr that, as he was the ruler, he should take the initiative. But the Amīr excused himself, saying that it was a matter of religion, in which supreme authority lay with the chief Qāzi. At last the first stone was thrown by the Qāzi, which gave Maulvi Abdul Latīf a fatal wound. The next stone was thrown by the unfortunate Amīr, and after this there was a volley of stones from all sides, and within a few minutes the martyr disappeared in a heap of stones. Orders were then given by the Amīr for watch to be kept on

his dead body, because he had said that he would rise after the sixth day. This occurred on the 14th July, 1903" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 446).

We now come to one of Aḥmad's cardinal principles, and the point of sharpest divergence between his faith and that of the majority of Muslims: to wit, his conception of *jihād*, or holy war.

When Muḥammad proclaimed the revelation: "Kill them (the infidels) wherever ye shall find them," and similar injunctions relating to "holy warfare,"¹ he laid upon his followers a sanction only slightly less binding than the five "pillars" already mentioned.² In particular, a saying of the Prophet: "War is permanently established until the Day of Judgment," has come down, with the Qur'ānic passages, establishing the fact that the *Dār al-Islām* ("Abode of Islām") and the *Dār al-harb* ("Abode of War") remain in a state of fixed antagonism until, by reason of conquest, there shall be only the one *Dar al-Islām*. The observance, however, is said to be in force when any single tribe or party of Muslims is engaged in the *jihād*, and it is only in times of special need that the entire body of Muslims is expected to take part actively in the war. When a country of the unbelievers is overcome, the citizens are given their choice of accepting Islām, and paying the *jizya* (poll tax), or being put to death by the sword. Many Sūfis hold that there is a greater *jihād* against a man's own rebellious nature, and a lesser *jihād* against unbelievers.

Along with this doctrine there has become fixed in the average Muslim's mind by many traditions the belief that the Maḥdī who is to come will be a man of blood, who will lead forth the entire host of Islām in a world-wide and altogether victorious *jihād*. Aḥmad fought early and late against this conception—a campaign which was related to his frequent declarations of loyalty to the British Government which might conceivably become the

¹ Cf. Qur'ān IX, 5, 6; IV, 76, 79; II, 214, 215; VIII, 39, 42; and many traditions in the *Mishkātū'l Masābīḥ*. A convenient résumé may be found under *jihād*, in Hughes: *Dictionary of Islām*, pp. 243-248.

² Cf. p. 57.

active object of *jihād* as popularly conceived. Whether Aḥmad's attitude, in a strictly Muḥammadan country, would have been similar to that of the many "bloody Maḥdis"¹ it is idle to surmise. Dr. Griswold has drawn attention to one potentially significant sentence in Aḥmad's "five principle doctrines," published in a memorial to Sir William Mackworth-Young, under date of March 5th, 1898, as follows:

"To preach Islāmic truths with reasoning and heavenly signs, and to regard *ghazā* or *jihād* as *prohibited under present circumstances*" (*Mīrā Ghulām Aḥmad*,¹ p. 11). (Dr. Griswold's italics.)

Dr. Griswold compares this to the bull of Pope Gregory XIII, issued in 1580, which released the English Catholics from the obligation to resist Queen Elizabeth (imposed by the bull of Pope Pius V), and allowed them to continue their allegiance to her *until they should be powerful enough to rebel openly*. If Aḥmad's phrase means anything, Dr. Griswold says, it must mean the same, but he generously adds,

"It is possible, however, that the phrase is meaningless, being used for the sake of literary padding, with an inadequate sense of its implication. We will give Mīrā Ṣāḥib the benefit of the doubt, especially since the phrase occurs nowhere else, so far as I know, in his writings" (*Mīrā Ghulām Aḥmad*, p. 12).

Aḥmad was much perturbed by Dr. Griswold's emphasis on that ambiguous sentence in his pamphlet, and issued a reply declaring that "present circumstances" are here contrasted with conditions at the time when *jihād* was sanctioned. This may indeed have been in Aḥmad's mind, although it only emphasizes his divergence from orthodox Islām, which allows no possibility of *jihād* being prohibited until the end, although it may be suspended in different parts of the world at different times. If, then, *jihād* is no longer in force, according to Aḥmadiya teaching, the question might be asked why it existed in

¹ Such, for example, as Syed Aḥmad, of Mysore and Hyderabad (1444-1504), Muḥammed Aḥmad, of Dongola (proclaimed Maḥdi of the Sudan in 1878), Syed Aḥmad, of Oudh and the Panjab (Conqueror of Peshawar in 1830), and Syed Muḥammad Husain, of Persia, the founder of the secret order of the Senūsites.

the early history of Islām as the Qur'ān and authentic histories of the spread of Muḥammadanism give abundant evidence that it did. Aḥmad's answer to this was that Muḥammad and the early *Khalīfas* had recourse to the sword, first to protect themselves from barbarian enemies and, afterward, to punish the latter for their barbarities. Aḥmadiya reasoning here is naïve and interesting. It is hard to see how those who assert that the early enemies of Islām were given the option of conversion or death can in the same breath argue that Islām was not propagated by force. We quote :

“ It must also be stated here that permission for self-defence and murdering the enemies of Islām was not given to the Muslims until the Arabs had, on account of their excessive oppressions and outrages and innocent bloodshed, rendered themselves culpable and liable to be punished with death. But a clemency was even then shown to such of them as embraced Islām. The unity of religion established a relation of brotherhood, and all past wrongs were forgotten. It is here that some opponents of Islām have stumbled, and from this they draw the conclusion that the new religion was forced upon the unbelievers. In fact, the case is just the reverse of what the objectors have thought. There is no compulsion here ; it was a favour to those who had rendered themselves liable to death. It is apparently absurd to take this conditional mitigation of just punishment for compulsion. They deserved to be murdered, not because they did not believe in the mission of the Prophet, but because they had murdered many an innocent soul. The extreme penalty of the law was upon them, but the mercy of the Gracious God gave them another chance of averting this merited capital punishment” (*Review of Religions*, I, pp. 20-21).

This flies directly in the face of history, for every true account of the early history of Islām shows that Muḥammad and the early *Khalīfas* acted continuously on the offensive.

At the present time, Aḥmad frequently remarked, Indian Muslims are happily situated under Christian rule just as, in the days of Muḥammad, the pioneers, driven from Mecca by the authorities, found a safe and happy refuge for a time under the Christian king of Abyssinia.

If among present-day Muslims the followers of Aḥmad, with their avowed abhorrence and repudiation of the idea of a “bloody Maḥdi,” are to be considered, *ipso facto*, loyal to the Government, the implication is suggested that the generality of Muslims must, on the contrary, be

disloyal. This imputation they naturally resented. It may be worth while to quote in full, as giving the other side of the case, a communication to the *Lahore Civil and Military Gazette* (May 22nd, 1907), written by a Muslim of the orthodox party, in reply to one of Aḥmad's familiar "exhortations to loyalty," issued at a time when a number of disloyal outbreaks were occurring in North India :

"The 'exhortation' to his followers, of Mīrẓā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān, the founder of a new sect, to refrain from participating in all disloyal movements, which has appeared in your paper as an appendix to Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn's communication, is all very well inasmuch as it aims at promoting the loyalty of a certain section of the Indian population ; hut this noble object should on no account be made the pretext by any one to bring false accusations against those whom one does not like on other grounds.

"Referring to the execution of Abdul Latif, a follower of his, in Afghanistan, Mīrẓā Ghulām Aḥmad states in his 'exhortation' that the deceased was stoned to death by Amīr Habībullah for the only fault that, having become one of Mīrẓā's followers, 'he opposed the doctrine of *jihād*,' in accordance with the Mīrẓā's teachings. To say the least of it, this is a very vague way of putting things. If, however, by saying so the Mīrẓā means—and by the general drift of his 'exhortation' it appears that he means it—that the view held by Amīr Habībullah Khān as well as by the general mass of Muḥammadans in India and elsewhere, about the doctrine of *jihād*, is calculated to shake the loyalty of the Muḥammadans in India, it should be emphatically declared that such an assertion is entirely unfounded, and is either based upon ignorance, or something else which is unworthy of a noble cause.

"It may also be stated here, for the information of the public, that Abdul Latif's real fault, which cost him his life, was that he had become a heretic (*murtadd*),¹ an offence which under Islāmic law is punish-

¹ For the laws relating to the death penalty for the *murtadd* (an apostate, not a heretic) see Hughes : *Dictionary of Islām*, p. 16. In a translation of the "Multaka ul Abhar" (*Meeting of the Seas*), a Turkish text-book of canon law by Ibrāhīm of Aleppo, Constantinople, 1290, A.H., pp. 396-397, the following summary is given :—"A man guilty of apostatizing is allowed a three days' respite if he desires it, after which, refusing to recant, he is to be killed. If he recants and again apostatizes he is again given the opportunity to reconsider. So in the third offence, but the fourth time he must be killed at once. His recantation must include renunciation of his espoused religion, as well as acceptance of Islām. He may lawfully be killed on sight, however, only the murderer in this case receives a reproof."

I am indebted for the references and the translation to Prof. M. H. Ananikian, of Hartford, U.S.A.

able with death. He became a heretic by following Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad, a pronounced heretic among Muḥammadans. . . . (Signed) Syed Muḥammad" (*Review of Religions*, VI, p. 230).

Aḥmad may well have congratulated himself that he lived under British rule, and as a branded heretic was saved the harsh fate meted out to his followers in Muḥammadan Afghanistan.

If Aḥmad depicted in dark colours the decadence of Muslims, and, in bright colours, the joy and security of living under a modern Christian government, the question naturally follows whether he inferred from those facts the superiority of the Christian civilization and ethics. This he by no means did, arguing as follows :

"The Christians, who from the present material backwardness of the Muḥammadan nations, hastily draw the conclusion of the failure of Islām to raise its adherents to a high standard of progress, should cast a glance at the history of Christianity and the Christian people in the thirteenth century after Christ, and they will, we hope, be convinced that their conclusions are illogical. Whatever the present material backwardness of the Muḥammadans as compared with the nations which are generally known as Christians, it is a fact that never at any stage of their history they were steeped in such ignorance as the Christians in the Middle Ages, when Christianity was as old as Islām is at present. In fact, it cannot be denied that while with the progress of Christianity civilization has decayed and with its deterioration civilization has made progress among the Christian nations, the relations of Islām to civilization have been different" (*Review of Religions*, VI, p. 424).

In other words, the pure principles of Islām brought to Muslims a high civilization early in its history, and the decadence of Islām is due to its departure from pristine ideals. Christian nations have attained to their present civilization not because, but in spite, of the ideals of Jesus Christ, in whose spirit and power Aḥmad came.¹ In January, 1908, the *Review of Religions* quoted, with seeming approval, some remarks in a book called, *The Awakening of Islām*, by William Heaford, from the French of Yahya Sidyk, in which the same logic is carried further, associating Islām, in its former and future perfection, with modern science, and Christianity with ignorance and obscurantism. We read that this author

¹ For a contradictory Aḥmadīya position, see p. 99.

“ Claims that the ideas of modern science, which have everywhere proved so fatal to Christianity and which in every European country are producing their natural fruit in European unbelief and triumphant rationalism, will serve to rehabilitate and vindicate Islām” (*Review of Religions*, VII, p. 43).

In the next chapter we shall deal in detail with Aḥmad's view of Christianity and its founder, and in this connection we shall see that another charge made by Aḥmad against modern Islām is its false belief in the taking up of Jesus into heaven, while another person, substituted for him, suffered death on the cross.

It would seem that Aḥmad painted the picture of present-day Islām as black as possible largely in his own interest. If the decadence of Islām has been due to its falling away from the teaching and example of the living Muḥammad of the seventh century, its rejuvenation in the twentieth century can only come through the teaching and example of a living “magnetizer,” to use a favourite Aḥmadiya expression. This person is the promised Messiah. His sound and conclusive arguments, his manifestation of heavenly wisdom and power, his mediation and intercession, can alone avail to counteract the present evil tendencies in the world, by bringing anew to faithless Muslims that certainty regarding divine truth, that perfect knowledge of God, in which, he held, salvation from sin consists.

CHAPTER IV

THE AḤMADĪYA MOVEMENT AND CHRISTIANITY

WE have already seen¹ that Aḥmad proclaimed that as the promised Messiah he had come in the spirit and power of Jesus Christ, and that his similiarity to Christ, in character and office, was such that he was called "Jesus" in several revelations in order to confirm the resemblance—not to say, the identity. In this chapter we have to look on the other side of the picture to determine his conception of the Jesus of history who, as *ʿĪsā*, is referred to in many passages of the Qur'ān. The question with which we are first confronted is the extent to which he drew on Muslim and Christian sources, respectively, for the materials of the finished portrait of Jesus that was in his mind. In the Qur'ān we find many ambiguous titles and characteristics ascribed to *ʿĪsā*,² such as "a word from Allah" (III, 40), "a spirit from Allah" (IV, 169), "One brought near," *i.e.*, to Allah (III, 40), "worthy of regard" (III, 40), a prophet (*nabī*'), a messenger (*rasūl*). He was said to have come with a Book, the *Injīl* (Gospel), to have been born of the virgin, Mariām, by a direct creative act of Allah (III, 42), and to have performed many miracles, including certain legendary miracles in the cradle and in youth, and, as a climax, the raising of the dead

¹ P. 31ff.

² The word *ʿĪsā* is believed to be a corruption of the Hebrew "*Esau*," the name by which Jesus had been satirically designated in Jewish writings, and which Muḥammad probably accepted as genuine. There are many Muslim explanations of the name. For a discussion of this subject see *The Moslem Christ*, by S. M. Zwemer; Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, Edinburgh, 1912, p. 33ff.

(III, 43). Although there is at least one passage in the Qur'ān which clearly refers to the death of Jesus (III, 47), Muḥammad unquestionably rejected the crucifixion, holding that Jesus was taken up alive into one of the heavens, apparently in his earthly body (IV, 156). There the Qur'ān seems to leave him, and tradition takes up the tale with its prophecies of the second coming. From the above it appears that Muḥammad had learned enough about the historic personage, Jesus Christ, probably from some heretical Christian teacher or monk, to lead him to give to 'Īsā a unique place among those to whom he accorded prophetic rank. The picture he draws, however, is the barest sketch of a person, resembling rather a wax figure on which a number of descriptive titles have been hung than the vigorous and compelling personality, of flesh and blood, who dominates the New Testament. It is, therefore, small wonder that Muslims have not been attracted to the figure of 'Īsā in the Qur'ān, and have proceeded to construct still a third character (unhistorical, like Muḥammad's 'Īsā) out of Muslim and Christian traditions and legends—a character which differs as widely from the 'Īsā of the Qur'ān as the traditional Muḥammad differs from the historic character who stands revealed in the pages of the Qur'ān.¹

As will appear more at length hereafter, Aḥmad not only rejected the orthodox conception that Jesus was never crucified, but the taking up alive into heaven as well, seeking to prove that he eventually died like all ordinary mortals, and was buried in Srinagar, Kashmir. Otherwise he seems to have felt bound to accept the Qur'ānic portrait of 'Īsā as historical, but he was obviously not familiar with the legendary Jesus, described at length, for example, in the well-known *Qisasul Anbiyā* ("Stories of the Prophets"). However, it was, as we have shown (pp. 31, 32), the Jesus of history with whom he really believed himself to be in some mysterious way identical. A flesh and blood personality it was who figured continually in

¹ Regarding this traditional Jesus, cf. Zwemer, *The Moslem Christ*, and Sell and Margoliouth, "Christ in Muḥammadan Literature," in *Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, II, p. 882ff.

his thinking and writing and who, if he had been able to analyze the content of his thinking on the subject, he would probably have discovered was for him actually the true, historic Jesus, whose life is recorded in the New Testament narrative.

His confusion of thought arose, of course, from a prior confusion regarding the Christian Scriptures and the *Injil*, referred to in the Qur'ān as Allah's revelation, or the Book, given to 'Īsā. There is no evidence that Muḥammad did not regard this revelation as identical with the Scriptures possessed by the Christians of his day. His charging the Christians with error in doctrine came in time, however, to be taken by Muslims as referring to a wilful corruption by the Christians of the *Injil*, so that its statements could no longer be accepted as trustworthy on the ground that Muḥammad had regarded them as inspired.

Among later Muslim theologians and commentators the attitude toward the Christian Scriptures runs all the way from that of Ibn Ḥazm (d. 1063 A.D.), who held that the only authentic knowledge of 'Īsā is that contained in the Qur'ān, to Fakhr-ud-dīn ar-Rāzī (d. 1209 A.D.), who frequently used Gospel passages to illustrate the Qur'ān.¹ Aḥmad would perhaps have us believe that he held to the former of these extremes, but, after analyzing all of his references to the Scriptures and to Jesus, confused as they are, I am inclined to think that, in his subconscious mind at least, belief in the historicity (although not, of course, in the divine inspiration) of the New Testament narrative prevailed. For practical purposes it would hardly be unfair to say that he admitted as true, temporarily, such parts of the New Testament as were needed to reinforce the argument in which at any moment he happened to be engaged. That none of it could be the inspired Word of God he was convinced, for the reason that it had been translated out of the original tongues, and on the orthodox ground that the texts were known to be

¹ See footnote to article, "Christ in Muḥammadan Literature," by E. Sell and D. S. Margoliouth, in *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, II, p. 885.

full of errors due to deliberate corruption by the Christians. Thus he writes:

“Jesus Christ had imparted pure and simple teachings to his disciples in the shape of Injil, which was deliberately corrupted by his subsequent so-called followers to such an extent that the present God of Christians can in no way be identified with the God of the Son of Mary.”

In order to cast doubt on the historicity of the Christian Scripture in the minds of his readers, he liked to quote from the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, of which he possessed a copy, seeking to convey the impression (possibly his own opinion) that the views of a certain extreme school of German critics of the last century, therein contained, are those of established Christian scholarship to-day. It is clear that he did not possess an historic sense sufficient to make him in any degree a true “higher critic” on his own account, nor was he willing to be bound by any one canon of criticism, even had he been able to recognize it. He felt that he was free to pick and choose, as suited his purposes, among the writings of those orthodox and liberal Christian scholars to which he had access. In the *Review of Religions* for May, 1903, for example, we read:

“The most trustworthy book containing the views of higher critics, and written by professed Christians, is the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, in which it is stated in column 1881 (Vol. II) that in all the Gospels there are only five absolutely credible passages about Jesus” (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 194).

These are then given as Mark 10: 17; Matt. 12: 31; Mark 3: 21; Mark 13: 32; Mark 15: 34; and Matt. 27: 46. The last two are parallel passages, and only the latter is mentioned in the original article in the *Encyclopedia Biblica*. These five were considered historical by the author¹ because they were opposed to any theory of Jesus’ sinlessness and divinity, and, therefore, would not have been forged by his disciples. As we shall see, however, Ahmad did not limit himself to these texts in his effort to prove that both Christians and Muslims have wrongly conceived of Jesus.

¹ Prof. P. W. Schmiedel, author of the article, “Gospels,” in *Encyclopedia Biblica*, Macmillan & Co., New York and London.

One further introductory remark should be made at this point. Aḥmad claimed that his reason for attacking Jesus was to be found in the alleged Christian attack upon Muḥammad. If Christians did not like his words about Christ they were to blame, because they themselves had maligned Muḥammad. Moreover, there was an inherent connection between the two attacks, for the sinlessness of all the prophets stands or falls on the same ground.¹ If Muḥammad was not (as Aḥmad believed he was) sinless, then neither was Jesus, and if (since) Jesus was not sinless, Aḥmad was prepared to make out as bad a case for him as possible. Finally, Aḥmad frequently said that he was not making the charges on his own account, but was only repeating attacks made by Jews and some professed Christians. What, he asked, could the Christians say in reply? Many times he declared that they could say nothing, that the attacks were unanswerable; and in making that assertion he certainly so far associated himself with the attacks and aspersions as to justify us in giving, as approved Aḥmadiya doctrine, whatever he and his editors have written about Jesus Christ. Furthermore, the *animus* lurking in the statements is scarcely disguised at all, and in more than one place he gives as his own some of the criticisms which we quote below. It is not a pleasant task to write this chapter of Aḥmadiya doctrine, but it is necessary since it is fundamental to a right understanding of the movement; and it may even be desirable, on wider grounds, since Aḥmad and his editors seem to have canvassed the literature of all ages and nations, in so far as it was accessible to them, in order to ascertain, and to unite in one mighty and virulent attack, all the efforts

¹ Orthodox Muslim doctrine, in general, declares that all the prophets have been miraculously "preserved from sin," but in the Qur'ān, where shortcomings of different prophets are cited, Jesus is alone described as uniquely "aided with the Holy Spirit" (II, 81), while Muḥammad asserts his own likeness to all sinful human beings in need of God's pardon (Qur'ān XIV, 42; XLI, 57). One Muslim tradition (*Mishkāt*, Bk. I, Ch. 3) declares that of all created beings only Jesus and his mother were without sin. In another (*Mishkāt*, Bk. XXIII, Ch. 12) we have Muḥammad admitting his own sinfulness, but unable to charge Jesus with sin.

that have been made to besmirch and belittle the character of Jesus of Nazareth.

Of the stories of the unique birth of Jesus, as given in the Qur'ān (XIX, 22-34; XXIII, 52), Aḥmad makes no categorical denial. He seeks, however, in various ways, to belittle their importance. Adam, too, "had neither father nor mother";¹ "thousands of worms (are) brought into existence without any father"; "learned physicians of the Greek and Indian schools have . . . shown the possibility of a child being formed in the mother's womb without the seed of man" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 72). John's birth, like that of Jesus, had a supernatural element, but, far from proving John and Jesus divine, "these births were in fact a sign that the gift of divine revelation was departing from the house of Israel. For Jesus had no Israelite father, and the parents of John were not in a condition to beget children" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 100²). In numerous passages (for example, *Review of Religions*, I, p. 144ff), usually under cover of quoting from Jewish or other writings, aspersions are cast on the character of the mother of Jesus, which we cannot give here, but which, together with much of the harsh criticism of Jesus, have evoked bitter and crushing replies from orthodox Muslims.³ We pause only to mention one curious argument in this connection, to the effect that "The qur'ānic statement that Jesus had no father cannot serve as a weapon in the hands of a Christian controversialist. The revelation of the Qur'ān is not with him a Divine Revelation, but the fabrication of a man" (*Review*

The Qur'ān declares that Adam, like Jesus, was born by a direct creative act. Allah breathed into him his spirit. See Qur'ān, III, 52.

² The supernatural birth of John (*Yahya*) is described in the Qur'ān, XIX, 11ff; XXI, 89.

³ Cf. p. 104 for the British Government's action taken against an Aḥmadiya periodical because of a scurrilous article which it published treating of the virgin birth of Jesus. It is worth noting that Professor Sirāj-ud-Dīn states, in the article by him to which allusion is made on p. 46, that Nūr-ud-Dīn, the successor of Aḥmad, told him during Aḥmad's lifetime that he himself believed that Jesus' birth was a natural one, but that he would not admit this in Aḥmad's presence for fear of incurring the displeasure of his chief.

of *Religions*, I, p. 144). One wonders, then, on what ground Aḥmadiya writers constantly quote the Bible, in confirmation of some of Aḥmad's claims and teaching, when in its present form it is for them no more of a divine revelation than is the Qur'ān for the Christians.

Regarding the miracles of Jesus, related in the New Testament and, in general, attested by the Qur'ān, with numerous differences and additions, there exists the same apparent ambiguity in the mind of Aḥmad's followers. Nowhere is it actually asserted that Jesus performed no miracles, but we are told, "Miracles are the only evidence on which the Deity of Jesus is supported, but to speak of his miracles as proof of his divinity is to produce one assertion in support of another. They lack the requisite evidence with which their own truth can be established. They have themselves no legs to stand upon, and it is, therefore, absurd to expect them to support something else. There is no reason why they should not be regarded as marvels and prodigies, carrying no more weight than the fictions recorded in the Purāṇas" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 453). And again it is said that Jesus himself denied having performed any miracles when he declared, "A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign, and there shall no sign be given unto it" (Matthew 12: 39). At times, however, the miracles of Jesus are admitted for the sake of proving the sinfulness of the acts involved, as in the first miracle at Cana, the cursing of the fig-tree, and the destruction of the herd of swine into which the evil spirits had been sent.

In one place the "neurotic theory" of Jesus' miracles is quoted from the *Encyclopedia Biblica*,¹ in accordance with which those miracles only are accepted which might be attributed to psychical influence on nervous maladies. In other passages the miracles are said to have been spiritual in their character, healing those afflicted with the leprosy of sin, *et cetera*. In various places we read that, after all, the miracles of Jesus were no greater than those of the Old Testament prophets, who must be considered

¹ Article on "Gospels," Vol. II, Column 1885.

divine as much as Jesus, on the basis of miracles wrought. In fact Jesus' miracles are in one place called

"Only imitations, much inferior to the original works of wonder done by the Israelite prophets in abundance" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 196).

An instance of Jesus' inferiority to Elijah is satirically suggested in that

"Elijah was honourably taken up to the heavens in a chariot, but Jesus Christ had not even a donkey to ride upon in his upward ascent, which by no means could have been an easy task" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 454).

Again, it is said that the miracles wrought by Muḥammad by means of his divine power far exceeded the miracles of Jesus, the only miracle of the latter referred to in that passage being the one (suggested to Muḥammad, it is thought, by a similar story in the apocryphal *Gospel of Thomas the Israelite*) found in the Qur'ān (III, 43), which relates that Jesus created a bird out of clay. In the immediately following sentences of the Qur'ān the miracles of the healing of the blind and lepers and the raising of the dead are narrated, but the Aḥmadiya writer does not here refer to them.

We come now to consider the character of Jesus, of whom Aḥmad wrote plainly, "In the same manner the Promised one (Aḥmad) has inherited the perfection of Jesus Christ" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 67). Here there is the same apparent distinction, about which he himself seemed never clear, between a vague, ideal Muslim Jesus (not exactly the *ʿĪsā* of the Qur'ān) and a human, sinful Jesus appearing in the Christian Gospels, of whom he writes :

"If the sinlessness of a person is to be inferred from the faultlessness of his conduct as admitted by his hostile critics, we would refer them to the Jewish writings, which seriously attack Jesus and his mother's conduct ;¹ and if it is to be inferred from the assertion of the person himself, we would refer them to the Gospel text where Jesus confesses that he is not good or sinless" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 207).

¹ Cf. p. 86, Note 1.

Jesus' baptism by John is held to be one proof of his admission of sinfulness. We will here briefly recapitulate the alleged "sins of Jesus":

Drunkenness. This is inferred from the institution of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, from his being called "a gluttonous man and a winebibber," and from his turning the water into wine at the wedding in Cana (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 114).

Vulgar abuse of the Jews, who, in return, "showed a leniency toward him far surpassing that of any of the modern priestly and missionary classes, however civilized the latter may be in appearance" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 371).

"There is not the least indication in the Gospels that the priests ever used a single abusive word for Jesus in opposition to all this fearful deluge of calumny and abuse. This contrast throws much discredit upon the morality of Jesus" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 456).

At other times Aḥmad deals less gently with the Jews who persecuted Jesus, and "on account of the wickedness of their hearts, failed to recognize the Reformer, and declared him to be a false prophet and pretender" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 55).

"They persecuted and tortured him, and at last brought him to law for alleged malcontentedness. . . . The priests in both cases (Jesus' and Aḥmad's) fail to effect their evil designs, and the providence of God saves his chosen servants" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 55).

Aḥmad also frequently excuses his own denunciation of his enemies on the analogy of Jesus' arraignment of the Scribes and Pharisees.

Cowardice. The evidences alleged to prove this trait were—(a) his prayer in the Garden of Gethsemane, combined with the statement in Hebrews 5: 7, which is interpreted to mean that because of his prayer he was saved from death (though another passage asks, "Can reason admit of the All-knowing God to have prayed the whole night long without being listened to?"); (b) his "hiding himself in the garden" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 270) in the attempt to escape arrest and crucifixion; and

(c) his cry on the cross (Matt. 27: 46) "Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani" (*Review of Religions*, IV, p. 355).

Disrespect to his mother. Referring to the marriage at Cana, we read:

"Jesus also insulted his mother on this occasion, and the apology, that he was under the influence of wine, cannot excuse him, for on another occasion (Matt. 12: 48), when to all appearances in a sober state, he behaved even more rudely towards her" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 463).

Friendliness with women of ill-repute. In this connection reference is made to the incident narrated in Luke 7: 37, 38, to the "too familiar connections of Jesus with Mary Magdalene, who, they say, was of a dubious character" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 141) and to an incident said to be quoted from *The Jewish Life of Christ*¹ that Jesus "once praised the beauty of a woman, and upon this one of the elders, who had taken Jesus in tutorship, enraged at this impropriety of his pupil's conduct, cut off all ties of love with him" (*Review of Religions* I, p. 141). It is said that accusations like those above are "freely published and circulated, not only in the streets of London but in distant corners of the world, India itself being no exception" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 120).

Blasphemy. He is said to have "sighted Almighty God by making himself his equal, and holding his sacred name in disrespect" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 141). And again, "The most disgusting and blasphemous words attributed to Jesus are those which contain his assertion of Godhead. This he did in spite of the knowledge that he was born from Mary's womb" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 452). Here, however, we are faced with another inexplicable contradiction. When there is need of proving that Jesus when he said, "Why callest thou me good? There is

¹ I have not seen this book. For the Jewish attitude toward Jesus the reader is referred to the article by R. Travers Herford, on "Christ in Jewish Literature," *Hastings' Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, p. 879; and to the article, "Jesus of Nazareth," by Dr. S. Krauss, in *The Jewish Encyclopedia*, Funk & Wagnalls, New York, Vol. VII, p. 160. These articles show by contrast how one-sided and unfair was Aḥmad's reference to Jewish writers as authority for his own arraignment of the character of Jesus.

none good but One, that is God" (Mark 10: 18) did not mean that he himself was God, we are told:

"If Jesus had distinctly put forth his claim to Godhead before the Jews, he would have been regarded by them as an heretic and the most sinful of men, who, by the law of Moses, deserved to be put to death" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 110).

And again, more positively:

"It should be borne in mind that the attribution of the claim of divinity to Jesus Christ is a false accusation against him, for he never made the extravagant assertion that he was actually God. The only reasonable inference that can be drawn from his words is that he claimed to be an Intercessor with God, and no one has ever denied the intercession of the prophets with God" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 416).

As *ʿĪsā* in the Qur'ān does not claim intercession for himself, this must be a reference to the words found in Hebrews 7: 25, here accepted by Aḥmad as authentic.¹

Finally, Aḥmad, who claimed to have had personal communications from Jesus, said:

"In short, I hold him in abomination, who, being born of a woman, says that he is God, although I declare Jesus Christ to be free from the charge that he ever claimed divinity for himself. With me such a claim is the most horrible sin and an arch-heresy, but I, at the same time, know that Jesus was a good and righteous servant of God, who never presumed to assert Godhead" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 348).

We leave our readers to solve the riddle.

False claim to prophetic office. It is said (a) that since Elias had not come previous to Jesus, according to Jewish prophecy, Jesus could not have been the Messiah; (b) that the Kingdom which the true Messiah would set up was to be a temporal Kingdom upon earth, and Jesus, realizing that he could not fulfil this prophecy, tried to satisfy the Jews with "a few assertions which practically meant nothing" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 152); (c) that his own prophecies proved false, *to wit* (1) "Greater works than these shall ye do" (John 14: 12); (2) "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise" (Luke 23: 43); whereas he was to spend the next three days in hell; (3) "This generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled" (Matthew 24: 34).

¹ See p. 36, Note 3.

Over against this we have to place the fact, already alluded to,¹ that Aḥmad grounded his claim to have come in "the spirit and power" of Jesus (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 192) on the fact that John had come in "the spirit and power of Elias" (Luke 1: 17); and he explains the prophecy analogous to (3) "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his Kingdom" (Matt. 16: 28) as a vindication of Ahmadiya teaching that Jesus did not die on the cross, but was still living at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. Other prophecies referring to the second coming point to Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad, and, we are told,

"Blessed are they who out of respect for the word of Jesus free themselves from all prejudice in considering this point and do not stumble" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 192).

Plagiarized teachings.

"The Gospel teachings have no superiority over the teachings of the earlier prophets. The teachings contained in the Gospels have, on the other hand, been taken from earlier sources, including the Talmud. The Jews have always forcibly asserted that there is no originality in the Gospel teachings, but that they are only plagiarisms from Jewish sacred books" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 167).

"It is hardly an exaggeration to say that whatsoever we learn from the Old Testament to be characteristic of the prophets is proved by a study of the Gospels to be characteristic of Jesus" (*Review of Religions*, V, p. 477).

"Jesus was no more than a humble preacher of the law of Moses, notwithstanding the extravagances of those who deify him" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 239).

"He called the prophets and saints that went before him thieves and robbers (John 10: 8), notwithstanding that his teachings were all borrowed from them" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 451).

On the other hand, continuing to allow Aḥmad to answer Aḥmad, we are told:

"Every new age stands in need of a new reformer and a new magnetizer. . . . To take one instance only, the Mosaic law laid stress upon vengeance only in all cases, while Jesus taught unconditional forbearance and non-resistance. Both these teachings were required by the special circumstances of the time when they were taught. As the law of Moses goes to one extreme by laying too much emphasis on retaliation, the teaching of Jesus goes to the other extreme by enjoining forgiveness and pardon of the offender in all cases" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 167).

Impracticability of central teaching of non-resistance. Aḥmad frequently contrasts this teaching with Muḥammad's more aggressive and warlike policy, declaring that "It tends to corrupt the morals of the oppressor by emboldening him in the commission of evil, and endangers the life of the oppressed" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 159). Nevertheless, the wars of Christendom are charged up to the example and precept of Christ :

"But in spite of his apparent helplessness, Jesus did not despise the sword altogether. 'He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one,'¹ he remarked on one occasion, and the later history of Christianity shows clearly that however wide may have been the departure of the Christian nations from the other teachings of Jesus, they have been quite faithful to their Master in acting up to the above injunction" (*Review of Religions*, V, p. 390).

Helplessness and failure. This is constantly insisted upon, in contrast to the ultimate worldly success of Muḥammad, the argument being that God visits with worldly success his true leaders among men. The taunt of the Jews (Matt. 27 : 42) is repeated, that if Jesus had been God he would have saved himself from his enemies.

"Can we reasonably imagine the All-powerful God arrested by weak human beings, put into custody, *chaloed*² from one district to another, beaten and smitten on the face by constables, and in the clutches and at the mercy of a few individuals" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 112).

Again we behold the strange contradiction. When Aḥmad is arguing in favour of his theory that Jesus escaped from the cross, and knew beforehand that he would escape, one reason given is that "Jesus knew it full well that God would never destroy him and his mission, but that ultimately success would crown his efforts" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 192).

Passing over some minor matters relating to Jesus' character, such as loss of temper, inconsistency and provincialism, we come to the fundamental question of his death. Aḥmad declared, unqualifiedly and repeatedly that if Christians were right in their assertion that Jesus died and rose again, Christianity was true and he was an

¹ Luke 22 : 36. ² A common Urdu word, meaning "made to go."

impostor. It is therefore important to examine in detail his alleged proof of Christianity's error in this respect. His position may be summarized as follows :

Jesus did not die on the cross, but was taken down by his disciples in a swoon, and healed within forty days by a miraculous ointment called, in Persian, *Marhām-i-Īsā*.¹ He then travelled to the East on a mission to the ten lost tribes of the children of Israel, believed by Aḥmad to be the peoples of Afghanistan and Kashmir, and finally died at the age of 120, and was buried in Khān Yār Street, in Srinagar, the capital of Kashmir.

The alleged proofs of this unique theory are contradictory and utterly unsound. As proof that Jesus did not die on the cross, the fanciful "swoon theory," ridiculed by Strauss and now discarded, was adduced to the effect that Jesus, whose legs were not broken, was taken down from the cross in an unconscious condition by his disciples, and later revived, a fact held to have been confirmed by the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus, which were those of a living man, not a disembodied spirit. In other passages Aḥmad seems to be advocating in part the so-called "fraud theory," which held that Jesus' dead body was removed from the tomb by his disciples to make possible their assertion that he had risen from the dead. Aḥmad would modify the theory to make the body still alive when removed from the tomb, so that Jesus could then be spirited out of the country within forty days. In support of this theory Jesus' prediction in Matt. 12: 40 is quoted, declaring that, "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the fish, so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." By interpreting the analogy literally Aḥmad asserted that Jesus must have been alive continuously in the tomb, as was Jonah in the belly of the fish.

The passage in Matt. 16: 28, "There be some standing here who shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," was interpreted by Aḥmad, as we have seen (p. 88), to mean

¹ Cf. p. 41.

that Jesus must still have been alive at the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus in 70 A.D.

Aḥmad also argued that if Jesus had actually risen from the dead and ascended into heaven, as Christians believe, Christianity to-day would not be spiritually dead, as he declared that it is.

So much for the escape from death on the cross. Even more fantastic are the "proofs" of Jesus' subsequent activities in the East and death and burial in Kashmir. First of all there is the *a priori* reason, based on Jesus' declaration: "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Matt. 15: 24). Who and where, Aḥmad asked, were these lost sheep? He replied that Jesus referred to the "ten lost tribes" of the original children of Israel.¹ These tribes, he asserted, were the ancestors of the inhabitants of Afghanistan and Kashmir, to whom Jesus must therefore have gone with his Gospel. The Hebrew characteristics and antecedents of the Afghans and Kashmiris were brought forward to substantiate the declaration, which did not originate with Aḥmad, that they represent the remnants of the original Kingdom of Israel.² It was insisted upon by Aḥmad

¹ It is now conceded by most scholars that the search for the ten lost tribes is a fanciful quest based on the false assumption that the entire population of the Kingdom of Israel was carried away captive by Sargon II, King of Assyria, and that it then maintained its distinct ethnic peculiarities. Only a small part of the population is now thought to have been exiled to Mesopotamia and Media (I Chronicles 5: 26), and it was doubtless soon absorbed in the native population.

See Cornhill: *History of the People of Israel*, Chicago, 1898, p. 126; or any other authoritative Old Testament history.

² The following paragraph from the article on Afghanistan in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, Ed. 1910, Vol. I, p. 315, will serve to show what basis there was for Aḥmad's contention:—"But the Hebrew ancestry of the Afghans is more worthy at least of consideration, for a respectable number of intelligent officers, well acquainted with the Afghans, have been strong in their belief of it; and though the customs alleged in proof will not bear the stress laid on them, undoubtedly a prevailing type of the Afghan physiognomy has a character strongly Jewish. This characteristic is certainly a remarkable one; but it is shared, to a considerable extent, by the Kashmiris (a circumstance which led Bernier to speculate on the Kashmiris' representing the ten lost tribes of Israel), and, we believe, by the Tajik people of the Badakshan."

that, since there is no record of Jesus' having visited those regions before his crucifixion, he must have done so afterward, a fact borne out by his words in John 10: 16, "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold . . . they shall hear my voice."

So much for the *a priori* argument. As far as the historic evidence that Jesus came out to the East is concerned, Aḥmad cited as his primary authority Nicolas Notovitch's *Unknown Life of Christ*, in which the author claimed to have seen an ancient manuscript in Tibet, describing a journey of Jesus to India for purposes of study during the interval between his visit to the Temple at Jerusalem and his baptism by John. Even had this story of Notovitch not been exploded by Prof. J. A. Douglas, of Agra, in 1895,¹ it is difficult to see how Aḥmad could think that a visit of Jesus to India in his youth, before his active ministry began, lends any support to the theory that he passed his later life, and died, in Kashmir.

Two other stories, introduced by Aḥmad as evidence for his theory, were the well-known tale of *Barlaam and Josaphat*,² in which various traditions are related with respect to an Indian prince (supposed to have been Buddha), variously styled Josaphat and Yūs Āfat; and an ancient tale translated into Urdu, *Ikmāl-ud-Dīn* ("Perfection of Faith"), now out of print, written by a Persian historian, Muḥammad Ibn-i-Bāhwaih, in the fourth century of Islām, which narrates the history of an Indian prince and saint named Yūs Āsaf, who wandered to Kashmir, where he died. In neither case did the hero, Yūs Āfat or Yūs Āsaf, an Indian, have any

¹ Cf. J. N. Farquhar: *Modern Religious Movements in India*, Macmillan, New York, 1915, pp. 140, 141. Also Prof. Douglas' article in *The Nineteenth Century* for April, 1896.

² Cf. article "Barlaam and Josaphat," in *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*, Funk & Wagnalls, New York, I, p. 485, where the origin of the story, falsely ascribed by some to John of Damascus, is traced to an Indian story, the *Lalitavistara*, composed some time between the beginning of the Christian era and 600 A.D. The version of the story in the Qādiān library, which I have seen, is that contained in Volume X of the *Bibliothèque de Carabas*.

connection whatever with Palestine or that section of the world, so that there is no shadow of a reason for identifying him with Jesus, even if we admit the bare possibility that there actually was such a man, who lived in India proper, or in Kashmir, many centuries ago, and at his death was buried in Srinagar, Kashmir.

This brings us to Aḥmad's culminating "proof" of his theory, the alleged "great discovery" that the tomb of Jesus is on Khān Yār Street, in Srinagar, Kashmir. In the summer of 1913, after considerable difficulty in learning its exact location, I visited this tomb, resembling hundreds of other tombs of Muḥammadan saints, with rags tied to the inner gate by those (both Muslims and Hindus) who had left money with the keeper to pay for the intercession of the occupant of the tomb. The Muslims of the city, for the most part, hold that this tomb was in the possession of the Hindus until the time of Bulbul Shāh,¹ who decided that it was the tomb of a Muḥammadan prophet and honoured it as such. Since that time Muslims have been in possession, calling it the tomb of an unknown prophet, named Yūs Āsaf. This tomb, Aḥmad declared it had been miraculously revealed to him, is the tomb of Jesus Christ. The first proof he brought forward was that the Kashmiris believed it was the tomb of a prophet, and since Muḥammad was the last of the prophets, and is known to be buried in Medina, this must have been the tomb of his predecessor, the prophet Jesus. But the more important proof had reference to the name Yūs Āsaf. Aḥmad said that the word Yūs, or Joseph, the Josaphat to whom reference has been made, was a corruption of Yasu,² called the original name of Jesus. The word Āsaf he declared to be the Hebrew word *āsaf*, to gather, which he said had reference to Jesus' mission as the gatherer of the ten lost tribes.

¹ The popular name of Syed Abdur Rahmān, who, arriving in Kashmir from Turkestan with 1,000 fugitives in the fourteenth century, is given the credit of establishing the Muḥammadan religion in Kashmir.

Cf. "Islam in Kashmir," by H. A. Walter, in *The Moslem World*, IV, p. 340.

² Yesu is the name for Jesus in Urdu.

Finally, there is the direct testimony of the Kashmiris themselves. In the pamphlet, *An Important Discovery Regarding Jesus Christ*, published by the *Anjuman-i-Ishā 'at-i-Islām*, we read that the testimony of "ancient documents of unquestionable authenticity and veracity receives considerable support from the statements of those who have read with their own eyes an old, now effaced, inscription upon the tomb, and who assert that it is the tomb of Jesus Christ."

And, later on, "The incontrovertible testimony afforded by the tomb itself, backed as it is by the unanimous oral testimony of hundreds of thousands of men, and by the written evidence of ancient documents, becomes, in our opinion, too strong to be resisted by the most determined of sceptics." No such testimony and no such documents exist.

The above paragraphs contain all the evidence on which Aḥmad and his followers soberly undertake to re-write for us the history of the Christian era.

Coming to Aḥmadiya conceptions of Christian doctrines, we find them vague and distorted. The doctrine of the Trinity¹ Aḥmad attacked with a virulent animosity, which, considered in connection with his access to Christian writings, makes his mis-statement of the true Christian position seem deliberate rather than unintentional. In different passages the Trinity is said to be denied by nature, human nature, the Jewish prophets, the Qur'ān, and by Christ himself. A familiar argument is the following: "Everything, in its simplest form, has been created by God in a spherical or round shape, a fact which attests to and is consistent with the the Unity of God. . . . Had the doctrine of the Trinity been true, all these things should have been created in a triangular shape" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 65).

¹ Regarding the Trinity, Muḥammad in the Qur'ān represents Jesus as answering in the negative the question asked him by Allah:—"Oh, Jesus, Son of Mary, hast thou said unto mankind, 'Take me and my mother as two gods beside God'?" (Qur'ān V, 116). He apparently here conceived of the Christian Trinity as consisting of the Father, Jesus and Mary.

The doctrine of the Trinity is thus summed up by a recent Aḥmadiya writer :

“Christianity requires one to accept the enigma that there are three Godheads, who are separate, at the same time one ; that each of them is absolutely perfect in himself, though it is a mental impossibility to think of more than one being who is absolutely perfect” (*Review of Religions*, XV, p. 440).

There are many ironical references to the Persons of the Trinity, such as the following, in exculpation of the Jews who (for purposes of Aḥmad's immediate argument) crucified Jesus :

“If the three persons of Godhead ever agreed on a matter, they agreed upon this that the Son should suffer upon the Cross. The Father wished it, the Son wished it, and the Holy Ghost wished it, and none of the three was a sinner on that account. Why are the poor Jews then condemned for wishing the same thing ? . . . Moreover, the Jews are not alone involved in the matter, the Gods themselves, including the one that suffered, had first of all come to the decision” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 457).

One more reference will suffice :

“The manner is very amusing in which the three Persons of Trinity shifted the responsibility of the reformation of mankind from one to the other. There was the Father, who, having a certain superiority, in name if not in reality, thought of restoring man to his original state—one should think it means the savage state, for the human progress has been gradual from a lower to a higher stage¹—but he found his hands tied by the strong manacles of justice. Out of filial reverence the Son offered himself, but when he came into the world, he went away with the empty consolation that the third partner shall come and teach them all truths and guide them into all truth. The third Person, being only a pigeon, found himself unable to undertake the teaching of truths, but thought he had done his duty by teaching the apostles a few dialects, which they were thus able to speak stammeringly” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 280).

Could deliberate blasphemy go to greater lengths?

Neither is any attempt made to set forth fairly the Christian position regarding the Atonement, rejected by Muḥammad, or to attack it consistently and logically. It is repeatedly referred to as the “blood-bath” (*Review of Religions* II, p. 135), which gives Christians a fancied immunity from sin, and hence “has emboldened in vice

¹ This evolutionary conception is foreign to orthodox Islām.

most of those who trust in it" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 136). It is declared to have "struck at the very root of the purity of heart among the general body of its indorsers" (*Review of Religions* II, p. 136). A contrary theory, which makes every Christian pay eternally for every sin, is attributed to Christians by Ahmad, in a lecture delivered at Lahore in 1904:

"The Christians also entertain the belief that a man shall be condemned to eternal hell for every sin, and that his tortures will know no end. But the wonder is that, while proposing endless torture for other men, the Son of God is made to bear punishment for three days only. This unrelenting cruelty to others and improper leniency to his own Son is absolutely inconsistent with the mercy and justice of God" (*Review of Religions*, III, pp. 327, 328).

The doctrine of the Incarnation is thus summarily dealt with:

'Christianity requires one to believe God begat a Son to whom he made over the godhood of the universe' (*Review of Religions*, XV, p. 440).

In spite of Ahmad's dislike of Christian missionaries, of a piece with his inherent hatred of all professional men of religion, including Muslim mullahs and maulvis,² he felt some respect, if not admiration, for the Christian missionary organization.

"The huge sums of money that are spent, the bulky volumes and the numberless leaflets that are written, the restless activity of the Christian evangelistic societies, and the plenty of resources they have in hand, are quite unknown in the history of any other movement" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 340).

Its success is readily admitted, as was needful since it represents *Dajjāl* (anti-Christ), and *Dajjāl* must have become very successful before the promised Messiah appears to put him to flight. He quotes from Maulvi Sher 'Ali, B.A., one of his followers:

"Lives are risked and money is squandered like water. Human brain cannot devise any means which have not been made use of by

¹ This is a misrepresentation of the Christian and (by implication) of the Muslim view of eternal punishment for sin, in which both religions believe.

² Cf. p. 69, Note 2.

Christian missionaries. They have spread all over the world like locusts. They have been to every land and have made their way into every home. There is no ear but has heard their voice, no eye but has read their mischief-spreading writings, and there are very few hearts which have not imbibed some kind of pernicious influence from them. Immense is the loss that Islām has suffered at their hands. . . . There were days when apostacy was unknown to Islām, but now thousands of Musalmāns have gone over to Christianity. Many among the Muḥammadans have found the temptation of Christianity to be irresistible, and thousands of the naked and hungry have adopted Christianity. Noble families have also fallen a prey to this Great Tempter. . . . The Holy Prophet said that 70,000 Musalmāns shall follow the *Dajjāl*. This prophecy, too, has been more than fulfilled" (Article on Anti-Christ, *Review of Religions*, IV, pp. 34-435).

The success of Christian missions among high-caste Hindus in India is disputed, as the number of conversions is so few, although in the *Review of Religions* for October, 1908, a Hindu writer in the *Vedic Magazine* is quoted to this effect :

"Christ got only twelve disciples in three years, and one of them betrayed him, another denied him and all fled at the time of his crucifixion. Thus the slow growth of a religious community need not deceive us. Who expected that the missionaries would convert all the Hindus in India the moment they landed? . . . When we look at the difficulty of the task that lay before these alien intruders, we are staggered at the amount of success they have attained. They come with a new Gospel; they have strange manners; they speak an unknown tongue. They work among a people who are deeply attached to their religion. To my mind the Christians are increasing at a rate which is truly appalling. . . . Remember Christians have doubled in thirty years. Let this formula be repeated so often that you learn to estimate its terrible significance, which is—that the death-shadow is approaching the Hindu community" (*Review of Religions*, VII, pp. 406-407).

The success of Christian missions among the low-caste peoples and the outcastes of India is sneeringly conceded. We wonder that any professed representative of so democratic a religion as Islām could thus quote with approval a Hindu writer :

"We think the good days of Christianity have gone by. . . . Nowadays the converts are found among the Pariahs, the Chandals, the Chamārs, the sweepers, the butchers, the butlers, and the most degraded and demoralized people, who are the pests of the country, and whose touch defiles the higher class men. These dunces, drunkards, debauchers, and starving rogues are now counted by millions among

the Christian converts in India, and the higher class people do still remain as 'untouched' by the influence of Christianity as ever" (*Review of Religions*, III, p. 378).

In the Panjab Census Report for 1901, it was said of Aḥmad that he began his work "as a *Maulvī* with a special mission to sweepers" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 83). Aḥmad's petition to Government to issue a denial of this statement¹ is interesting for the light which it reflects on the missionary activities of the Aḥmadiya movement in contrast to Christianity. I quote it in part:

"2. That this statement is altogether false and groundless, and most injurious and harmful to my honour and reputation.

"4. That the sweeper class is specially associated with crimes, and to represent me as connected with that class when there is not the slightest foundation for such a charge is to represent me as being in a state generally considered disgraceful. The sweepers in this country are looked upon as the most degenerate class of people, and the statement made in the Census Report is calculated to do the greatest harm to my reputation, and to hurt the feelings not only of myself, but also of the thousands of the most loyal and respectable subjects of the Government who follow me as their guide and leader in all religious and spiritual matters.

"5. That my principles and doctrines, which I have been preaching since the very beginning, are morally so sublime and spiritually so exalted that they are not suited to, and accepted by, even Muḥammadans of a low type and bad morals, to say nothing of the sweepers, and that they are accepted only by intelligent and noble-minded men who lead pure and angelic lives, and that my followers actually include in their number Ra'ises,² Jagirdars,³ respectable Government officials, merchants, pleaders, learned *Maulvīs* and highly educated young men" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 83).

How different was Jesus' attitude, reflected in his saying, now so often quoted in India, "I came not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance" (Luke 5: 32).

The Christian establishment of schools, colleges and hospitals is praised without qualification in several passages, although in one place we read:

¹ Undoubtedly a mistake due to Aḥmad's having been confused with his first cousin, Mīrzā Imām-ud-dīn, who undertook such a mission to the Chuhṛa, or sweeper, community.

² Ra'is is a person of authority, a chief.

³ Jāgirdār is the holder of a jāgīr, the perpetual tenure of a tract of land subject to quit rent and service.

“The arguments (for Christian missions) derived from the establishment of hospitals and schools are too silly to have the slightest effect upon any reasonable person” (*Review of Religions*, V, p. 438).

The Christian missionary attitude of alleged antagonism toward Islām is fiercely censured, although in his later years Aḥmad seems to have discovered a new attitude of respect and sympathy on the part of some Christian missionaries toward Islām, and even admitted that they were setting the Āryas a good example in this respect.

We need not linger long over Aḥmad's invectives, already alluded to, on the subject of the degeneracy and weaknesses prevalent in Christian lands. He does not, like his pupil, Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn,¹ attribute the weaknesses and failures of Christianity in history to St. Paul, as though he were its founder. Rather, he writes conclusively, “The deadliest sin is to be attributed to him (Jesus) that he is at the root of all Christian corruption” (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 159). There is the usual contradiction, however, to be found in the first number of the *Review of Religions*:

“It cannot be denied then that the fold of Christ to-day is walking in a path different from that in which it walked in the days when the presence of its holy keeper exercised its wholesome influence over it. . . . Is the wholesale debauchery and excessive drinking of Christian Europe in accordance with what Jesus taught? . . . It is not true that it is all owing to the absence of the holy personage who worked so wonderful a transformation in the apostles?” (*Review of Religions*, I, pp. 3, 4).

The free intermingling of the sexes is held responsible for much of the immorality in the West, and over against it the Muslim requirement of “the veil” is upheld as the ideal. Such prostitution as exists in Western lands is charged to the Christian ideal of monogamy, and the Muslim practice of polygamy is given the credit for the alleged absence of the social evil in Muslim countries, where woman's position is held to be higher than in Christendom. Drunkenness and gambling are declared to be everywhere prevalent in Christendom, and, in this connection, absent from Islām.² The Christian mis-

¹ Cf. *Muslim India and Islāmic Review*, I, p. 137.

² See, however, p. 68ff.

sionaries and clergy are charged with being as corrupt and drunken as the entire Christian civilization of which they are the professed exponents. That Christianity is dying out is asserted with the same monotonous regularity that characterizes the assurance that the day of Islām's revived glory and power has been ushered in by the promised Messiah.

CHAPTER V

THE AḤMADĪYA MOVEMENT AND THE INDIGENOUS RELIGIONS OF INDIA

TOWARD Hinduism in all its ramifications Aḥmad turned an uncompromisingly hostile face. For all its cherished beliefs he had only sneers. After stating, "Of all the birds I have an extreme liking for pigeon flesh, because it is the emblem of the Christian Deity" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 347), Aḥmad ironically praised the Hindus for not making their sacred cow an article of diet.¹ He scoffed at the theory that the Ganges water can wash away sins, considering it analogous to the Christian doctrine of sanctification. The Vedas were denounced as having given birth to the lowest forms of fetishism and idolatry, and to religious festivals, among some Hindus, which are "characterised by horrible scenes of incest and adultery." Their polytheistic tendencies are contrasted with the strict monotheism of the Qur'ān: "I would like to be told in which part of the world the four Vedas² have blown the trumpet of monotheism. In India, which is the home of the Vedas, we find that a variety of creature-worship prevails, such as worship of fire, the sun, Viṣṇu, and so on, so that the bare mention of such worship is a disagreeable task. Travel from one end of India to the other, and you will find the entire Hindu population deeply immersed in nature-worship. Some worship Mahādevajee,³

¹ Anyone living outside of India can scarcely realise what a studied insult this is to a Hindu whose practice of vegetarianism has for him the most sacred significance. Cf. p. 69, Note 2.

² Rīgveda, Sāmaveda, Yajurveda, Atharvaveda.

³ "The Great God," a name of Śiva, who is associated with Brahmā and Viṣṇu in the Hindu Trimūrti.

others sing odes in honour of Kṛiṣṇajee,¹ and the rest prostrate themselves before idols of every description" (*Review of Religions*, XV, p. 204). The editor of the *Review of Religions*, in the issue for July, 1908, quotes from the *Vedic Magazine*, for June, the reasons there given by Professor Max Müller (taken from his *India : What it Can Teach Us*) for his belief that the religion of the Vedas is not monotheistic (*Review of Religions*, VII, p. 272). Likewise, the alleged universality of the Vedas is vigorously disputed.

Of the heroic figure of Rāma² it is said: "Rāma of Hindu mythology has also been deified, but he too had to suffer the disaster and disgrace of his wife being kidnapped." In another passage we are asked to "consider the jealousy which Rām Chandra showed when his wife Sita was kidnapped by Rāvana" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 140). This jealousy is not, however, condemned. The Purāṇas³ are described as "fabulous legends," and again, of Hinduism as a whole it is said, "the whole system is a mere plaything, a mass of fabulous traditions, which must vanish away before the light of science and knowledge." The doctrine of transmigration is condemned because, (1) "It divests the Divine Being of all his glorious attributes and of his power and control over the universe"; (2) it "sweeps away all distinctions between legality and illegality" and vitiates the purity of family life, "for it is possible under this fantastic law that a person's own mother, daughter or sister may be re-born to be his wife" (*Review of Religions*, I, p. 409-410); (3) it is unfair to the soul that, after having once attained salvation, it should be "turned out of the

¹ An incarnation of the god, Viṣṇu, the hero of the *Bhagavadgīta* ("Song of Love").

² One of the two best-known incarnations of the god Viṣṇu, the other being Kṛiṣṇa. He is the hero of the great Hindu epic, the *Rāmāyana*, which tells of the theft of Rāma's faithful wife, Sita, by the demon Rāvana, and her eventual recovery by her husband.

³ A group of sectarian Hindu sacred writings that followed after the Vedas and the Upaniṣads, in the first millennium of the Christian era. They contain the later myths, mostly of an unwholesome character, attaching to Kṛiṣṇa.

salvation house to undergo another series of births and deaths, and this merely because of the helplessness of God and his inability to create new souls" (*Review of Religions*, VII, p. 477).

Notwithstanding the worthlessness of the Vedas, in Aḥmad's eyes, the members of the Ārya Samāj¹ are denounced for their neglect and ignorance of the Vedas, in spite of their boasted regard for them. Replying to an Ārya attack on those former Hindus who had adopted the Aḥmadiya version of Islām, the *Review of Religions* contemptuously stated

"for the information of the public that the Qādiān Ārya Samāj shall be the last body in the world to prove its Vedic learning and erudition. So far as we know, the body is constituted of village shopkeepers, money-lenders, retail grocers and small hucksters, who are ignorant of the Vedas. In contrast with this class of shopkeepers, who have deserted their old Hindu faith for that of Pundit Dayānand, the Hindus who accepted Islām are mostly educated young men, of whom some have studied up to the B.A. standard, and who read the Vedas in Urdu and English and spend day and night in the study of religious lore."

The attack on the Āryas gathered around two foci:

1. The assertion of the co-eternity of soul and matter with God, which "borders actually upon atheism, and is practically a denial of the need of God's existence."
2. The doctrine of *Niyoga*,² held to mean that "if there is a woman who is living in actual matrimony and has a living and healthy husband who cannot raise male children to her, i.e., either only daughters are born or there exists some other reason on account of

¹ The Ārya Samāj, founded by Swāmi Dayānand Sarasvatī in 1875, holds that only the original Vedic hymns are fully inspired, and that they contain all the truths of religion and of natural science. It believes in one personal God and in transmigration and karma as the law of human life. Matter and soul, as well as God, are considered eternal, and the three constitute a kind of trinity for both religion and science. The Samāj is aggressively missionary in character.

² This form of temporary marriage, established by the founder of the Ārya Samāj, is now for the most part repudiated by his followers. A man might contract this relation with eleven women in succession, and a woman with eleven men. For further details see the article on the Ārya Samāj in Hastings' *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, II, p. 60.

which some time passes without the birth of a child, it is the duty of the husband to invite a third person to his house to have sexual connection with his wife ; and this shameful course may be continued until eleven male children are born to the woman from the stranger's seed " (*Review of Religions*, II, pp. 139-140).

In "The Message of Peace," however, Aḥmad seemed to accept the Vedas as genuine scriptures, and rightly declared that the justification of the repulsive practice of *Niyoga* could not be found in them :

" Similarly the doctrine of the *Niyoga* is attributed to the Vedas. Human nature revolts at this hateful doctrine. But as I have already said, we cannot believe this to be the teaching of the Vedas. . . . That millions of people have been believing it to be the word of God is, however, a sufficient reason of its truth, for it is impossible that the word of an imposter should enjoy the honour which the Vedas have enjoyed " (*Review of Religions*, VII, p. 256).

The Āryas are particularly denounced because of their violent abuse of, and attacks upon, Muslims and Christians. *The Review of Religions*, in 1908, quoted from Ārya writings a series of attacks on Christian teaching, such as that Christ was "an ignorant savage, who did wicked deeds and who set up a fraud to become a religious leader " (*Review of Religions*, VII, p. 121), and then said of them :

" We are surprised to find that the very expressions which are considered adornments of sacred books in an uneducated country like India are punished with imprisonment in free and advanced England. . . . How far the right to criticize entitles a man to depict another in the darkest colours and to use abusive and contumelious language is a different question, which I shall not try to answer in this article. It is, however, clear that the line must somewhere be drawn between liberty and license " (*Review of Religions*, VII, pp. 124-125).

That there is a limit, nevertheless, to the British Government's toleration of such "contumelious language" was illustrated in 1914 in the prosecution, under the Indian Press Act, of the Editor of *Badr*, an Aḥmadiya vernacular paper, because of articles, relating to the birth of Jesus Christ, tending to bring subjects of Great Britain in India into contempt.¹

¹ See also p. 69, Note 2.

In Aḥmad's last "Message of Peace," several times referred to above, he made the astonishing proposal of a kind of union of his sect with the Ārya Samāj, and with Hinduism generally, on a basis of mutual concessions, as follows:

"If, in order to have complete peace, the Hindu gentlemen and the Ārya Samājists are prepared to accept our Holy Prophet, may peace and the blessings of God be upon him, as a true prophet of God, and give up denying and insulting him, I will be the first man to sign an agreement to the effect that we, the members of the Ahmadiya sect, shall always continue to believe in the Vedas and to speak of the Vedas and the *ṛishis*¹ in the most respectful terms, and bind ourselves to pay to the Hindus a penalty of Rs. 300,000 in case we fail to fulfil the agreement. If the Hindus cordially wish for this peace they should also sign a similar agreement. This agreement will be as follows: 'We believe in Muḥammad Mustafa, may the peace and the blessings of God be upon him, and regard him as a true prophet. We will always speak of him respectfully, as a true believer should. And if we fail to fulfil this agreement, we shall pay to the leader of the Ahmadiya movement Rs. 300,000, as a penalty for breach of agreement. . . . But in order to make the agreement strong and sure, it will be necessary that it should be signed by at least 10,000 intelligent men on both sides'" (*Review of Religions*, VII, p. 257).

There was, of course, no response to this impossible proposal, which was regarded by the Hindus as a kind of gambling venture.

Little attention was paid by Aḥmad to the quiescent Brāhma Samāj.² It is referred to as having been really a hindrance rather than help to the spread of Christianity, because, although it admits the greatness of Christ, "those who have any Christian proclivities find a refuge in the vagueness of Brahmaism."

¹ A seer, or inspired poet, in general; used specifically in the Purāṇic period for "seven primeval personages born of Brahmā's mind, and presiding, in different forms, over each manwantara." Balfour: *Cyclopaedia of India*, I, p. 424.

² A theistic reforming movement, which appeared in Calcutta in the first quarter of the nineteenth century. It was an attempt to form a pure spiritual religion by blending some of the leading ideas of Hinduism and Christianity. It has now split into three sections, the Ādi Samāj, the Sādhāran Samāj, and the New Dispensation Samāj. Its three great leaders have been, successively, Rām Mohan Ray, Debendra Nath Tagore and Keshub Chandra Sen,

More attention is paid to the Sikh off-shoot of the parent Hindu tree. Guru Nānak,¹ the founder, sought to teach "religion, pure and undefiled"—the remembrance of God and the doing of good—and made his appeal to Hindu and Muslim irrespectively. Aḥmad, however, claimed to have made the unique discovery that Guru Nānak was a genuine and acknowledged Muslim, and was sent to teach Hindus the truth of Islām :

"It is undoubtedly true that the person of Nānak was an embodiment of divine mercy for the Hindus, and he was, as it were, the last *avatār* of the Hindu religion who tried hard to purge the hearts of Hindus of the great hatred which they entertained against Islām, but to the great misfortune of this country the Hindus did not avail themselves of the holy teachings of Nānak. On the other hand, the Pundits of the Hindu religion persecuted this great man only because he admitted the truth of the religion of Islām. He had come to bring about a union between Hinduism and Islām, but he was not listened to" (*Review of Religions*, VII, p. 248).

Aḥmad gave many reasons, besides the fact of direct revelation, for his statement that Guru Nānak was a Muslim. At Dera Bābā Nānak, in the Panjab, there is preserved a *cholā* (cloak) said to have been worn by Nānak and his successors up to the fifth guru.² According to Aḥmad, this *cholā* was said to have had a miraculous divine origin, and tradition declared also that verses from the sacred scriptures of all religions had been written upon it by the hand of God. Several hundred coverings, placed over the *cholā* by successive generations of Sikhs, obscured the writings : but by special arrangement, on the 30th of September, 1895, the coverings were removed to allow Aḥmad, who had undertaken a pilgrimage

¹ Nānak (1469-1538), like Kabīr, his contemporary, condemned the system of divine incarnations and preached against idolatry as practiced in Hindu temples. He retained the doctrine of Transmigration and Karma, and made no change in the Indian social system. Many Muslims as well as Hindus became his disciples, and it is possible, though not historically established, that he made the pilgrimage to Mecca. The *Granth Śāhib*, or Noble Book, the sacred scripture of the sect, is now accorded almost idolatrous worship.

² There were ten gurus in all. After that the *Granth Śāhib* became the abiding guru.

for the purpose, to view the sacred relic. Aḥmad then discovered that "From top to bottom the verses of the Holy Qur'ān, especially those refuting the false doctrines of other faiths with regard to Divine Unity and attributes, were written upon it" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 32).¹

And we are told that obviously "Nānak wore the *cholā*, that no one might be deceived as to the religion he professed. . . . How could he be best known as a Muḥammadan except by wearing a cloak which could not be worn by any but the truest Muḥammadan?" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 33).

This discovery by Aḥmad is held to be another proof of his Messiahship.

"As, on the one hand, a death-blow has been dealt to the Christian error of resurrection and ascension, by the discovery of Jesus' tomb in the Khān Yār Street, at Srinagar, the false notion of the Sikhs that Nānak professed any religion other than Islām has been brought to naught by the discovery of the sacred *cholā*. Through centuries of Sikh warfare, the *cholā* was preserved to serve as a testimony of the truth of Islām at the appointed time when the sun of its truth was to shine forth in its full effulgence . . . the *cholā* was miraculously preserved so that it may both fulfil the prophetic word in relation to the appearance of the Promised Messiah to accomplish the object of making Islām the predominant religion by strong arguments and heavenly signs, and be a testimony to the truth of Islām by showing that it was from this source that the founder of a great religion received all his blessings" (*Review of Religions*, II, p. 35-36).

Other evidence, of Nānak's Muḥammadan tendencies adduced by Aḥmad were that he dressed like a Muslim, frequented the company of Muslim saints, and ascetics, performed the pilgrimage to Mecca, married into a Muḥammadan family, and spoke of the deity in the terminology not of Hindu thought but of the Muslim *Ṣūfis*. It was even said that he enjoined, and himself observed, the Muslim requirements as to repeating the *Kalima*,² keeping the fasts, performing the prayers and refraining from prohibited food.

¹ I have questioned several well-informed Sikhs about this incident, but found them unable to verify it.

² The witness of the Muslim that there is no God but Allah, and Muḥammad is his Prophet.

The two following quotations from Macauliffe's book, *The Sikh Religion*,¹ will indicate what basis there is in Sikh history and tradition for the *cholā* story, and for Aḥmad's other alleged proofs of Nānak's devotion to the Muslim faith.

"The Guru (Nānak) set out towards the east, having arrayed himself in a strange motley of Hindu and Muḥammadan religious habiliments. He put on a mango-coloured jacket, over which he threw a white safa, or sheet. On his head he carried the hat of a Musalmān Qalandar,² while he wore a necklace of bones and imprinted a saffron mark on his forehead in the style of Hindus. This was an earnest of his desire to found a religion which should be acceptable both to Hindus and Muḥammadans without conforming to either faith" (I, p. 58).

"After his (Nānak's) successful discussion with the Yogis, the Guru decided to visit Makka, the pole star of Muḥammadan devotion. He disguised himself in the blue dress of a Muḥammadan pilgrim, took a faqīr's staff in his hand and a collection of his hymns under his arms. He also carried with him, in the style of a Musalman devotee, a cup for his ablutions and a carpet whereon to pray. And when an opportunity offered, he shouted the Muḥammadan call to prayer like any orthodox follower of the Arabian prophet" (I, p. 174).³

Aḥmad had no such love for modern Sikhism as he pretended to have for its founder; which is not surprising when one remembers the vicissitudes undergone by his own family in the days of Sikh ascendancy in the Panjab. He once said:

"The brief term of Sikh ascendancy was marked by complete anarchy and bloodshed, and the people were plunged into unspeakable misery. . . . At last the measure of Sikh iniquity became full to the brim, and the time came when the plundering career of these marauders was to receive a check. The British came from the East like a rising

¹ Max Arthur Macauliffe, *The Sikh Religion*, in six volumes, Oxford, 1909. The author spent many years in compiling the contents of this massive work from the writings in the vernacular of the Sikhs themselves. The historical portions are of value rather for the picture they give us of the great Guru, as his followers have conceived him, than as a trustworthy historical document.

² An order of Muslim darwishes, or ascetics; also used of any faqīr.

³ I am informed by my friend, Sardār Tāra Singh, of the staff of the Khālsa (Sikh) High School, in Lahore, that there is supposed to be a *cholā* of Guru Nānak at Dera Bābā Nānak, and that there are Arabic characters upon it which no one has been able to decipher.

sun and dispelled the dark clouds of Sikh tyranny. They gave the country not only peace and tranquillity, but above all religious liberty, which to me seems the greatest boon which a just ruler can confer upon a subject people."

Ahmad had little personal contact with the Buddhist religion, which is practically non-existent to-day in India proper, and hence we find few references to it in his writings and in those of his followers. To-day, however, the sect is spreading in Buddhist Burma, and no doubt more attention, of an unflattering variety, will be paid to that religion by Ahmadiya writers in the future.

Buddha's alleged weaknesses are referred to in one place as follows :

"Whenever a man has been deified God has shown his weakness and infirmities in all points. Buddha was made a God, but in the discharge of his duties as a husband and a father, the most sacred of the obligations of man towards man, he was an utter failure. Nor was he able to observe the other duties towards his fellow-beings, and thus entirely neglected one of the two parts of the law. As to the other part, *viz.*, his duties toward God, he offers no better example. He did not believe either in miracles or in the acceptance of prayer. Thus he could not find out the path in which the elected of God have walked."

In the attitude of the present head of the movement toward other religions, there is evident at times a more eclectic and irenic spirit than we have found in Ahmad. In an article by him in *Review of Religions*, for March, 1916, he upholds the thesis that all religions are from God, but that either they have been limited to a certain people and locality, or else they had lost their original character at the time when the Qur'ān, containing the universal and final religion abrogating all others, was sent down to Muḥammad. This is bringing up-to-date and making definite for India to-day the principle enunciated in the Qur'ān that to every people a prophet and book were sent, after which Muḥammad, the last of the prophets, came to the Arabs with the Qur'ān, by which all previous revelations were abrogated.¹ In accordance with this development we read, in the article mentioned above :

"So in comparing Islām with other faiths, nothing is farthest (*sic*) from my purpose than to call other faiths pure human under-

¹ Cf. Qur'ān, LXI, 5; LXIV, 46.

takings and the prophets of the world so many imposters. On the other hand, it is my bounden duty as a Muslim to bear witness to the truth of all the righteous servants of God, wherever they had happened to appear, and admit without any reserve or demur the truth of the Indian prophets, Rāma and Kṛiṣṇa, quite as readily as that of the Israelite prophets. It is, again, my business to testify to the truth of the Persian sage, Zoroaster, or any other heavenly personality who claimed to be the recipient of Divine revelation, who was backed up with Divine succour and favour, and for whose acceptance millions of minds were opened by God" (*Review of Religions*, XV, p. 84).

CHAPTER VI

THE AḤMADIYA COMMUNITY

IN the first chapter, in giving an account of the life of Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad, the general line of development of the sect was traced up to the death of the founder in 1908. We saw that the real beginning of the movement, as a distinct sect within Islām, came in 1891 with the Mirzā Ṣāhib's announcement that he combined and fulfilled in his own person the prophecies regarding the promised Messiah and the Maḥdī. However, we may say that the Aḥmadiya community, as such, owed its inception to the earlier declaration of Aḥmad, in March, 1889, that he was entitled to receive *bai'at* (homage) from his fellow Muslims. The first of the disciples attracted by this announcement was Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn, who was destined to become the "first *Khalīfa*." In the beginning the Mirzā Ṣāhib's followers were called Qādiānīs, or Mirzāīs, partly in derision and partly to distinguish them from other Muslims in whose worship in the mosques they refused to participate. In 1900 the members of the community were, at their own request, entered under the name "Aḥmadiya" in the official census list of the Government of India, as a distinct Muḥammadan sect, and it is by that name that they prefer to be known. In 1891, as has been written above, the storm of opposition broke upon Aḥmad from orthodox Islām, the Ārya Samāj, and Christianity—the forces of the opposition being led, respectively, by Maulvī Muḥammad Husain, Pandit Lekh Ram and Mr. Abdulla Atham. This period of acute controversy, which included nearly all of his prophecies, ended with the order of the Government of the Panjab, dated February 24th, 1899,

to which reference has been made above,¹ although it must be said that the Mīrzā Ṣāhib did not altogether adhere to his enforced promise, as illustrated, for example, by his later prophecy regarding John Alexander Dowie.²

In the year 1896 the community numbered 313 members. In the Census of India Report for 1901, 1,113 male Aḥmadīs were returned for the Panjab, 931 for the United Provinces and 11,087 for the Bombay Presidency. It is certain that the number returned for the Bombay Presidency was inaccurate, since throughout its history a majority of the members of the community have been found in the Panjab. The total strength of the movement in the Panjab at that time was given as 3,450. Aḥmad himself in that year claimed 12,000 followers (*Review of Religions*, XV, p. 457). Three years later, in 1904, his claim had grown to "more than two hundred thousand followers," and the editor of *Review of Religions* has recently seen this number doubled in his imagination, and writes that "in 1904 the number of Aḥmadīs rose to 400,000 persons" (*Review of Religions*, XV, p. 47). Shortly before his death, in 1908, Aḥmad stated that the full strength of the movement throughout the world was then no less than 500,000. No evidence whatever is given to substantiate these reckless statements, and we must set over against them the returns of the Government of India Census of 1911 where, in the section on the Panjab (Vol. XIV, Part 2), the statistics of the movement are given as follows: Males, 10,116; Females, 8,579; total, 18,695. No returns were made for the whole of India in the Census, but the Panjab returns give us a clue to the total strength of the movement. In 1912 Dr. H. D. Griswold stated³ that in his opinion 50,000 would be a liberal estimate of the numerical strength of the Aḥmadiya movement at that time. Allowing for a considerable increase in the six years that have since elapsed, it is safe to say that at the very most there are not more than 70,000 followers of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad at the present time.

¹ P. 43. ² Cf. p. 45. ³ *Moslem World*, II, p. 373.

After the death of the founder, in 1908, the direction of the movement passed into the hands of Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn, the first disciple, who appears to have been a studious, clever and industrious man. In accordance with the last will of the founder, the affairs of the community were placed under the control of a committee, called *Ṣadr-Anjuman-i-Aḥmadiya* (Chief Aḥmadiya Society¹), which (it was assumed by all, though not clearly stated in the will) was to be under the direction of the elected head of the movement, now known as the "*Khalīfat'-ul-Masīḥ*" (Successor of the Messiah). Nūr-ud-Dīn, as the first *Khalīfa*, abstained from assuming undue authority, and considered himself merely a servant of the *Anjuman* to do its bidding. Under this policy the community made some progress, in spite of the loss of the magnetic personality of its original head. There were, however, signs of division that became more evident and ominous with each passing month. These first became manifest in 1913, at the time of the Muḥammadan riots following the Government's action in attempting to remove an abutting portion of a mosque in Cawnpore in order to realign a road. The entire Muḥammadan community in India was aroused, and among those who expressed themselves very earnestly at this time was Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn, already referred to² as a leading member of the Aḥmadiya community, who had just begun the publication of a Muḥammadan magazine³ in England. As this was a notable departure from the counsel of Mīrẓā Ghulām Aḥmad, that his followers should avoid all political controversy and concentrate their energies on distinctly religious effort, it was to be expected that some of the members of the community would view Kamāl-ud-Dīn's action with alarm. The resultant protest was most strongly voiced in an Aḥmadiya vernacular paper, *Alfāz*,

¹ It thus became a Samāj, analogous to the Ārya Samāj and Brāhma Samāj in Hinduism.

² P. 17. Cf. *Muslim India and Islāmic Review*, 1, p. 366ff.

³ Then known as *Muslim India and the Islāmic Review*. The name has since been changed to *The Islāmic Review and Muslim India*.

by its editor, Mīrzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad, the eldest son of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad by his second wife. Before this controversy within the community had proceeded far the cause of the original trouble in Muḥammadan India was removed by the action of the Viceroy, Lord Hardinge, through which the entire difficulty was adjusted to the satisfaction of the Muslims concerned. A number of the most prominent members of the Aḥmadiya community, however, continued to cherish resentment against the son of the Mīrzā Ṣāhib, who, they felt, was inclined to assume undue authority for his opinions because of his relationship to the founder of the movement. On the other hand, many conservative Aḥmadīs felt that Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn and his party had been disloyal to the memory of the founder in making common cause with Muḥammadans throughout India in political controversy, as well as in having joined the All-India Moslem League, which had been denounced as pernicious by Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad.¹ During the last illness of Nūr-ud-Dīn both parties were active, the party of the Mīrzā's son in preparing for his immediate election to the office of *Khalīfa*, and the opposing party in issuing and distributing a booklet giving it as their interpretation of the Mīrzā's last will that there should be no *Khalīfa* at all, but rather that the *Ṣadr-Anjuman-i-Aḥmadiya* should have entire control of the affairs of the community. Immediately following Nūr-ud-Dīn's death, Mīrzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad was elected *Khalīfa* by a gathering of Aḥmadīs in Qādiān, despite the protests of members of the other party who were present and who thereupon seceded, and, with all who shared their opinions, formed a new *Anjuman*, with headquarters at Lahore, called *Anjuman-Ishā' at-i-Islām* (Society for the Spread of Islām). In the absence of Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn in England, the leadership of this party fell to Maulvī Muḥammad 'Alī, M.A., LL.B., who has already been referred to² as the able editor of *The Review of Religions* since its inception, and who had prepared the pamphlet regard-

¹ Cf. page 67. ² P. 17.

ing the *Khalāfat* preceding Nūr-ud-Dīn's death. The chief immediate point of dispute between the two parties was whether or not the original *Anjuman* should have full control of the affairs of the community. The question had not become acute in the time of Nūr-ud-Dīn, because of his tactful handling of the situation, but with the election of a son of the founder, who had already tended to presume upon his family relationship and who was likely to arrogate to himself an increasing degree of authority, further compromise was impossible and a permanent split inevitable. The difference was really a fundamental one, involving the essential nature of the claims the founder had put forward. The Qādiān party, as we may now call it, held that he must be considered one of the prophets (*nabī'*), in spite of the fact that orthodox Islām believes that Muḥammad was "the last of the prophets and the seal of the prophets."¹ Further, they declared that since only those are true Muslims who believe in the prophets of God, those who do not so accept Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad are "*kāfirs*" (unbelievers), with whom no true believer may worship, no matter how many other points of belief they may share with Muslims.² On the other hand, the seceding party held that the "Promised Messiah" made no such outstanding claim for himself, and they are unwilling to call non-Aḥmadī Muslims *kāfirs*. In general, the latter minimize the difference between the Aḥmadiya community and orthodox Islām, whereas the Qādiān party regard the points of difference as of fundamental importance. This is evident in many ways. The Qādiān party still insist on the importance of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad's prohibition of true Aḥmadīs from following non-Aḥmadī *imāms* in their prayers, attending non-Aḥmadī funeral services, and giving the hands of their daughters to non-Aḥmadī men, although their sons are permitted to marry

¹ Cf. p. 109.

² Cf. Appendix VI for a ruling of the High Court of Patna, Bengal, by which Aḥmadīs were declared to be Muslims, at liberty to worship behind any recognized *imām*, but not entitled to form a separate congregation in the mosque.

non-Aḥmadi girls. The Lahore party believe that these prohibitions were only necessary in the early days of the movement and had but a temporary significance. In their writings and missionary work the person and claims of Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad are almost invisible. At most they consider him to be only the latest of the *Mujaddids*,¹ and his influence survives only in their belief in the death of Jesus and his burial in Kashmir, and in the hostile attitude toward other religions which is found among them to an extent that does not exist among educated Muslims generally in India to-day.

In dealing with the recent history of the movement, we shall have to consider the two divisions separately. With regard to the members of the Qādiān *Anjuman*, the controversy with the alleged disloyal party has had the effect of fusing their loyalty and intensifying their zeal, as being now the orthodox, faithful people. The present *Khalīfa* does not seem to be a man of his father's force, although, as he is still a young man, it is too early finally to appraise his character. He is described as follows by a friendly writer in the issue of *Review of Religions* for June, 1915 (XIV, p. 217) :

"He is a young man, below thirty years of age, fair of complexion, of medium height, slender of build, with a clean broad forehead, thin lips, thick short beard, eyes which through their half-open lids always look to the ground, modest and retiring habits; such is the appearance of the man who now guides the destiny of this community. . . . His life is simple and retiring, and his manners sincere and affable."

This fairly well describes my own impression of the man on the occasion of my two conversations with him at Qādiān, in January, 1916. He strikingly resembles his father in appearance, in his sedentary habits and in his readiness and cleverness in controversy. He is also, like his father, a semi-invalid. He has recently married a second wife without divorcing the previous one, who is still living.

There seem to be no such outstanding personalities in this segment as there are in the Lahore *Anjuman*; but in this group of loyal supporters of the *Khalīfa* there is present an earnest spirit of enterprise and industry. The original

¹ Cf. p. 131, Note 1,

Ṣadr-Anjuman is vigorously pushing forward education in the community. The keystone is the English high school at Qādiān, which contains about four hundred students in all the grades from primary through the fifth high standard, and which is affiliated to the Panjab University. About half of these students come from outside Qādiān and one hundred of them are non-Aḥmadīs. The former headmaster, Maulvī Ṣadr-ud-Dīn, B.A., B.T., went out with the secessionists and will be mentioned later.¹ His successor, Maulvī Muḥammad Dīn, B.A., is ably prosecuting the work in the new building just completed. Of the twenty-five students who went up for the matriculation examination of the Panjab University in 1916, twenty-one passed, a very high average. There is, likewise, a *madrasah*² for the study of Arabic and the Qur'ān, in which more than seventy-five students are enrolled, of whom thirty are expected to go out as missionaries when the seven-year course is completed. Primary schools have been opened in different districts and many more are projected. A beginning has been made in the education of women, and the status of women, on the whole, seems to be above the standard obtaining in Islām generally. On three days a week the *Khalīfa* addresses all of the members of the community, after the evening prayer in the mosque.

On the literary side, in addition to the English monthly paper, *Review of Religions*, less vigorously and ably edited than in the long period of M. Muḥammad 'Alī's editorship, the following vernacular papers are published at Qādiān: tri-weekly, *Alfazal*; weekly, *Alfarūq*, *Alhakam*, *Nūr*; monthly, *Tashīz-ul-Azhān*, *Ṣādiq*, *Review of Religions* in Urdu; quarterly, *Tafsīr-ul-Qur'ān*. A former paper, *Badr*, whose stormy career was interrupted by Government in 1914,³ has not since re-appeared, but its editor, Mufti Muḥammad Ṣādiq, now edits the paper callid *Ṣādiq*.

The new *Anjuman Taraqqī-i-Islām* (Society for the Advancement of Islām), founded by the present *Khalīfa*,

¹ P. 125.

² A Muslim school or college for the study of religious subjects solely.

³ Cf. p. 104.

to supplement on the religious side the work of the *Ṣadr-Anjumān*, has been active in missionary efforts. It claims to be supporting twelve paid missionaries in different parts of India, Ceylon and Mauritius, as well as in London, where there is one, with a paid assistant, whose work is entirely distinct from that of the *Kamāl-ud-Dīn* party. Ambitious plans are afoot to send further missionaries to "England, Ceylon, Java, Japan, China, the Philippines, etc." In addition to these regular workers, "All the Aḥmadīs are regarded as honorary workers, and school teachers as well as editors are also sent on preaching tours whenever occasions arise." The converts have mostly come from the ranks of orthodox Islām, and are most numerous, outside the Panjab, in parts of Bengal, the Deccan and Malabar.

The following quotation from the Government Census Report for Bengal, Bihar and Orissa, covering the period from 1901 to 1911, gives an illuminating summary of Aḥmadiya missionary activities in that part of India where, as in the Panjab, Muslims represent an important element of the population :

"The Aḥmadiya doctrines appear to have been first introduced in Bihar in 1893, when a Musalmān missionary of Bhagalpūr became a convert. The movement has already gained a considerable number of adherents from among the educated and well-to-do classes. They are most numerous in Bhagalpūr and Monghyr, which form one section with a committee affiliated to the *Ṣadr-i-Anjuman-Aḥmadiya*, that is, the central committee at Qādiān. Funds are raised for the propagation of the Aḥmadiya doctrines and for the publication of its monthly magazine, the *Review of Religions*. . . . In Monghyr the Aḥmadiyas have met with considerable opposition from the orthodox Musalmāns. At a large meeting held at Monghyr, in June, 1911, the claims of Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad were debated, and after long controversy he was denounced as a heretic and renegade. The sect has even made its way into Orissa. Some educated Musalmāns of Cuttack embraced its doctrines during a visit to Gurdāspur, and in their turn succeeded in winning over some of their co-religionists in Puri ; their total number is however small."

Two years later a missionary at Brahmanbaria, in East Bengal,¹ thus described the growth of the sect in his

¹ Rev. John Takle, of the New Zealand Baptist Missionary Society, author of *The Faith of the Crescent* (Association Press, Calcutta, 1913).

village, which had its beginning in the secret interest of a high school maulvī teacher :

“ During the Puja vacation he went the long trip to Qādiān on purpose to find out on the spot whether the Maḥdī and his sect were true or not. He and the four men who went with him came back, initiated followers and now about fifty ignorant Muhammadans in the town have gone over to his side, much to the angry disgust of the orthodox section. On the first Friday after the return of the maulvī a religious riot was averted only by the prompt action of the magistrate. The renegade maulvī had all along led the Friday prayers, but after his return the orthodox Muhammadans were determined that he should not enter the mosque, so they locked the door on him. He and his party went to the mosque bent on breaking it open, but the magistrate appeared on the scene and prevented him. Feeling is running high here just now, and subscriptions have been raised for the purpose of bringing some learned maulvīs to argue out the matter with the pervert.”

Another missionary in the same station (Rev. W. F. White) writes : “ They do not carry on any open propaganda, but work quietly in the villages trying to propagate their tenets. Occasionally some lecturers come from other places, but they are not allowed to lecture in public gatherings.”

We have already seen¹ how the Aḥmadī who introduced the movement into Timapūr, in the Deccan, where there is now a large community of the Mīrzā Šāhib's followers, in time formed his own sect and attracted to his party several hundred former Aḥmadīs.

The following account of Aḥmadīya activities in Malabar is given in the *Bombay Advocate* of 31st August, 1915 :

“ The Aḥmadīya movement among the Musalmāns, which had its origin in Gurdāspur, in the Panjab, has secured about three thousand followers in the Moplah² centre of Cannanore in North Malabar.

“ For some time past the orthodox and this new party, which believes in the advent of another prophet like Christ in place of Esanabi,³ and

¹ P. 46, Note 1.

² The Moplahs (Māpillas), comprising nearly the whole of the Muslim population of Malabar (about 800,000), are descendants of Arab immigrants of the eighth and ninth centuries, with a considerable admixture of Hindu blood. They have in the past shown fanatical hatred of the Hindus, but are to-day, for the most part, peaceful traders.

³ I.e., ‘*Isā nabī*’, the Prophet Jesus.

whose creed is a sort of Protestant Muḥammadanism, have been in open hostility, the latter being subjected to a number of annoyances and ill-treatment. The tension has now become very severe, and pamphlets of an inflammatory nature, calculated to create disturbance, are circulated broadcast.

"A Musaliar¹ of the orthodox party is reported to have been recently arrested by the police in connection with it. The Neo-Musalmāns, who are in a minority, are petitioning district authorities to afford them protection from the orthodox party, who are hostile towards them and who have excluded them to a certain extent from the mosques."

The following quotation from the *Ceylon Independent*, quoted in *Review of Religions* for June, 1916 (IV, p. 224), indicates that the movement is active in and about Ceylon :

"The Ceylon Aḥmadiya Association. . . . A meeting of this Association at 10, Wekanda, Slave Island, on the 19th instant, Mr. T. K. Lye presided. Mr. C. H. Mantara read letters from the Aḥmadiya headquarters at Qādiān and the Islāmic Mission in London. He announced the formal initiation into the Aḥmadiya Movement of Professor Abdul Latif, lecturer at Chittagong College, Dr. Syed Usmani, of Panipat, and the Imām and others of the Rose Hill Mosque at Mauritius. Resolved that a revised scheme for a mission to Java and the Far East be submitted to headquarters. Resolved that the printing press be established at Slave Island, and a journal in English and Tamil be started, to be called *Islām*, and also that the names and addresses of all would-be subscribers be ascertained by the secretaries. After a study of the Holy Qur'ān the meeting terminated with the usual vote of thanks and with prayers to Allah."

To this is appended, in *Review of Religions*, a note from the honorary secretary of the *Anjuman-i-Aḥmadiya* on Slave Island :

"The Tamil paper, *Islām Mittrian*, is attacking us most severely, we are being grossly misrepresented, and if our voice is not raised against these calumnies, the cause of the Aḥmadiya in Ceylon may be prejudiced."

The annual gathering of Aḥmadīs from all parts of India at Qādiān each December tends, as does the pilgrimage to Mecca in the case of the orthodox, to inspire in the pilgrims fresh zeal for the cause, as opportunity is furnished to hear the leaders of the movement and to meet with other Aḥmadīs from distant

¹ The Musaliars are the Moplah *maulvīs*, travelling preachers and teachers of the Qur'ān and the commentaries.

places. On my visit to Qādiān, in 1916, at the time when the annual assembly was just closing, I was generously entertained in European style in a house that had been built by an Aḥmadī police inspector of Bengal for his use when he came to Qādiān on the pilgrimage.

A recent undertaking of the *Anjuman Taraqqī-i-Islām* has been the translation of the Qur'ān into English, with notes and cross-references . . . the entire work to be published in thirty parts, of which one has appeared at this writing (1918).¹ A reason given in the preliminary advertisement for this translation is, that "the English translations so far published have been done either by those who have been swayed by nothing but religious prejudice, and whose object was certainly not the manifestation of truth, but the presentation of a ghastly picture of the Holy Qur'ān before the world; or by those who had no acquaintance worth the name with the Holy Qur'ān and the Arabic language, the result being that those translations are too poor reading to afford anything like a real insight into the excellencies of Islām."

We will let that sweeping arraignment of the labours of Sale, Palmer and Rodwell, as well as of several Muslim translators,² speak for itself. The commentary on the Qur'ānic verses is written, as we should expect, wholly from the Aḥmadīya viewpoint, and combines the presentation of Aḥmadīya teaching with continual tilting at Western critics of the Qur'ān, especially Sale and Wherry. Typographically the work is excellent.

With regard to the present beliefs of the members of the Qādiān party, one of them who speaks with authority has given me, in writing, the following three chief tenets:

"1. The Qur'ān is the word of Allah revealed to the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, whose own words are preserved in the tradition. It is from A to Z, with the arrangements of chapters and even vowels, from Allah. It is the perfect and final code of law, and the words of the Prophet, as embodied in the traditions, are its commentary.

¹ Cf. article, "The Koran According to Aḥmad," by R. F. McNeile, *Moslem World*, VI, p. 170 (April, 1916).

² For an account of the translations of the Qur'ān into English, see Zwemer, *Moslem World*, V, p. 244.

"2. Revelation did not stop with Muḥammad; it is nowadays also sent to the righteous servants of God. The living example of a recipient of Revelation has been, in our time, the person of Aḥmad, the promised Messiah. This continued revelation is only for the support of the Qur'ān and of the truth of Muḥammad's mission.¹

"3. Muḥammad is, according to Aḥmad's teaching, the perfect man and model for human guidance. He is free from sin. He is a servant of Allah. It is he through whom one can have access to the gates of heaven. To say that Christ, Son of Mary, will come for the reforms of Muḥammad's people is to us a blasphemy and derogatory to the high dignity of the prophet of Arabia."

Regarding the respective positions occupied by Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad and Mīrzā Bashīr-ud-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad, the same informant writes :

"Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad came in the spirit of Christ and was the second manifestation of the Prophet of Arabia. His advent was promised by all the prophets of yore. Sāhibzāda² (Bashīr Aḥmad) is the second successor of the promised Messiah, and it is believed that promises for the spiritual revival and progress of Islām are to be fulfilled in his time. He is the promised son of the promised Messiah; for the Messiah was to marry and beget a son."

Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad himself is reported to have said : "My second manifestation shall appear in the form of my successors, as it appeared after the Holy Prophet in the person of Abu Bakr, Omar, etc. A man from God from among my own children will arise, and shall be named the Promised Reformer. His shall be the time of conquests for Islām."

In this we can trace a possible beginning of a "doctrine of the person of the second *Khalīfa*," who clearly occupies already a position superior to that of Hakīm Nūr-ud-Dīn, in whose veins no blood of the promised Messiah flowed, and in whose day no prophecy of a spiritual revival was destined to be fulfilled.

A belief in the intercession of Muḥammad on the last day, and in the miracles of the prophets, are other articles of faith that are being emphasized to-day. The May, 1915, issue of the *Review of Religions* explains in detail how it was possible (in the view of the Qādiān party) for Aḥmad to be a prophet, in spite of the universal Muslim belief

¹ Cf. p. 55.

² *Sāhibzāda* is equivalent to "Young Master," and is often used of the heir-apparent to a throne as well as in the general sense of an honoured son.

that Muḥammad was the seal (*i.e.*, the last) of the prophets.

“ A man can even gain prophethood by the help of our Lord Muḥammad’s spiritual powers. But no prophet with a new book or having been appointed direct will ever come ; for in this case it would be an insult to the perfect prophethood of our Lord. . . . According to this we believe that a man—the Promised Messiah—has gained prophethood in spite of his being a follower of our Lord,” *i.e.*, of Muḥammad ” (*Review of Religions*, XIV, p. 196).

Aḥmad himself said the same thing in a slightly different way :

“All the doors of prophethood are closed save one, *i.e.*, that of completely losing one’s individuality in that of the prophet. One that approaches the Almighty through this door begins to reflect the same old prophethood of Muḥammad. He becomes a prophet, but we cannot call him a new prophet for he is one with his master ” (*Review of Religions*, XV, p. 475).

When asked about his doctrine of future salvation,¹ following the Judgment, the present *Khalīfa* informed the writer that orthodox Muslims, since they are *kāfirs*, who do not believe in the prophetship of Aḥmad, cannot hereafter be admitted to the Garden. When pressed, however, he declared that there was hope that they and, in fact, *kāfirs* of every variety, might reach Paradise ultimately. He then dwelt at length on his interesting personal belief in ultimate universal salvation. At first, he said, only those who are perfect in faith and works (perfection in works consisting in conformity with the fundamental requirements of Islām, getting a 51 per cent. pass-mark, as he expressed it) would be admitted ; while outside would be ranged all the various grades of unbelievers, reaching down to the lowest hell. These would then begin to ascend toward Paradise and, as they became true Muslims, would be admitted, until at last Allah’s mercy shall have comprehended all. He was willing to concede that the

¹ Orthodox Muslims believe that a Muslim who has committed greater sins (*kaḥīra*) must pass a purgatorial period in the Fire, from which he can only be saved by the intercession of Muḥammad. The heretical Mu’tazilite (*cf.* p. 65, Note 3) denied that Muḥammad’s intercession could accomplish this. Lesser sins (*saghīra*) can be removed in many ways. See also p. 36, Note 3.

seceders belonging to the Lahore party would, through Muḥammad's intercession, secure early admittance to Paradise, by reason of their faith in the promised Messiah, although they will find themselves sadly deficient on the score of works.

Darwishes, Ṣūfīs, saint worship and asceticism of all kinds are under the ban as emphatically at the present time as in Aḥmad's lifetime, yet it seems that already the tomb of Aḥmad has become to some extent an object of superstitious regard in the eyes of his followers, whose desire and duty it is to visit Qādiān at one of the annual gatherings in December, there to behold the scenes of the promised Messiah's life and ministry, to hear his teachings expounded by his son, and to offer prayer before his tomb.¹

In the Appendix further facts are given regarding the present beliefs and constituency of the Aḥmadiya community.

The work of the two Qādiān *Anjuman*s is supported by contributions of the faithful throughout India,² and, in addition, every true believer is expected to leave behind him a will which bequeathes at least one-tenth of his property to the cause. The Qādiān community makes no appeal to orthodox Muslims for funds and claims to be wholly supported by Aḥmadīs.

Turning now to the *Anjuman-Ishā'at-i-Islām*, with headquarters in Lahore, there is little, if any, propaganda carried on by its members on behalf of the Aḥmadiya movement as such. The appeal which is made by the leaders and missionaries of this party is to Muslims generally, urging them to forget their differences and unite in order to further the interest and spread of Islām throughout the world. Their pristine educational venture, in 1915, took the form of a so-called "college" in Lahore, where a number of young men were trained to become missionaries of Islām. According to a statement written for me at that time by a member of this *Anjuman*, "the admission qualifications for the college are

¹ Cf. p. 24.

² The regular *zakāt* (alms) must all be sent to Qādiān, as the *Bait-ul-Māl* (treasury).

the matriculation examination of the Panjab University, or other equivalent examination, or Munshi Fāzil, or Maulvī Fāzil, that is, high proficiency in Persian or Arabic with English equivalent." Maulvī Muḥammad 'Alī, M.A., LL.B., was the chief member of the staff, which contained a "Professor of Hadīs,"¹ a "Professor of Bible, Hebrew and Arabic grammar," and a "Professor of Islāmic and other history." It might be of interest, as casting light on the relationship between the two parties, to quote a paragraph from a letter of a member of the staff of *Review of Religions*, from whom information about the Lahore "college" was requested—given with no understanding that it be considered confidential:

"There exists no college worth the name, for a class of hired students (about half a dozen), taking instruction from an ordinary maulvī and an incompetent Christian convert, cannot rightly be termed a college. I do not think that such an irregular institution can do useful work. There are already a lot of classes of the kind opened and maintained by Muslims, but they all lack the life-giving spirit, so marvellously manifest in the institutions of Qādiān. You may guess the reason, for the living and the dead cannot be on the same par; and the nominal followers of Aḥmad of Qādiān cannot reap a good harvest after their vain attempts at putting a scythe to the green fields of Qādiān. They will, along with their mimic institution, disappear from the scene in the near future, and be merged in the vast, but dead, Muslim community. This being the case, what sort of work can this so-called college do, and what good can we expect from it?"

The "college" has been discontinued, but in 1916 the *Anjuman* opened a "Muslim High School and Senior Cambridge Local College" in Lahore, with Maulvī Ṣadr-ud-Dīn, B.A., Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn's former associate in the Woking Mission, at its head. I am informed that there are upwards of one hundred students, of whom a few are in residence, who are being prepared for the Cambridge Local Examination. The English Bible is taught (1917-18) by a Christian chaplain, Rev. F. F. Shearwood.

In the autumn of 1918, a hostel "for the benefit of Muslim collegiate students" was opened by the *Anjuman* in Lahore.

In addition to this educational work, other activities of the Lahore *Anjuman* consist of the publication of the

¹ Cf. p. 56, Note 3.

tri-weekly *Paighām-i-Ṣulāḥ* in Urdu, and also of some literature, including another translation of the Qur'ān into English, completed in December, 1917, by Maulvī Muḥammad 'Alī, the president of the *Anjuman*. The *Anjuman* claims to have several missionaries in different parts of India, whose purpose is "to advance the cause of Islām." It has also inherited from Aḥmad his *penchant* for holding public debates on religious themes.¹ A growing interest in politics, on the part of this *Anjuman*, was evidenced by the sending of a deputation, headed by Maulvī Ṣadr-ud-Dīn, to Mr. Montagu, Secretary of State for India, on behalf of the so-called Congress-Moslem League Scheme of Home Rule, in December, 1917. *The Islāmīc Review and Muslim India* is published in English at Woking, and, in addition, an Urdu edition is published in Lahore and a Malay edition in Singapore.

A species of social service has been undertaken by the *Anjuman* on behalf of the criminal tribes of Kot Mokhal in Sialkot district of the Panjab. In 1917 the total income of the *Anjuman* amounted to Rs. 36,923-0-9, and the expenditure totalled Rs. 34,479-10-9. An anniversary meeting of the *Anjuman* takes place in the Aḥmadiya buildings, Lahore, each December.

The chief missionary interest of this branch of the Aḥmadiya community centres in the mission in England, to which reference has already been made.² Its founder, Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn, a graduate of Forman Christian College, Lahore, received his B.A. in 1893, became a pleader in Peshawar and then in Lahore, and early in 1912 proceeded to England as a missionary of Islām. He first established his headquarters at Richmond, but in August, 1914, moved with his helpers to Woking, in Surrey, where there already existed a mosque, built by the late Professor Leitner, a former principal of the Oriental College, Lahore, and given by his heirs after his death to the Muslim community. Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn believed that his first duty was the removal of the misrepresentation

¹ Cf. Appendix VIII for a typical Aḥmadiya challenge to a public debate.

² Cf. p. 118.

of Muḥammadanism which he held was current in Christian circles in the West. To further this end he commenced the publication of the paper, first named *Muslim India and the Islāmic Review*. He also seized every opportunity of delivering lectures on various subjects connected with Islām. For instance, in January, 1913, a debate was arranged at Cambridge on the subject of "Polygamy," in which it was stated, in favour of polygamy (as reported in the *Islāmic Review*), that "even God was pleased to take birth in the house of a polygamist, as the blessed Virgin was the second wife of Joseph, father of the Lord." On another occasion the subject of the position of women in Judaism, Christianity and Islām was discussed and compared, and it was argued that Islām had done more than all other religions to raise the status of womankind. At the International Congress on Religious Progress, held in Paris in July, 1913, Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn delivered an address on the subject of Islām and received a cordial reception. All such meetings are reported at length in the *Islāmic Review*, which, in addition to Muḥammadan apologetics, contains a great variety of attacks on the Christian faith and its founder, similar to those quoted in Chapter IV above. At first some space was given in the paper to political affairs in connection with Islām in India, but of late the articles have been almost wholly religious in character.

In addition to the mosque at Woking, the Mission has rooms at 111, Camden Hill Road, Notting Hill Gate, London, W.,¹ where Sunday religious lectures, Friday prayers, with sermon, and literary and scientific lectures, on alternate Thursdays, are held. The last-named are promoted by the London Muslim Literary Society, which, like the Central Islāmic Society, the Society of London Muslims, and the British Muslim Association, is a British development of Aḥmadīya Islām.

A number of English ladies and gentlemen have professed conversion to Islām, the most prominent being

Cf. Appendix V for a newspaper report of a meeting in the former London headquarters of the Mission at Caxton Hall.

Lord Headley, an Irish peer, engineer and sportsman, who is now the president of the British Muslim Association.¹ Other English Muslims who are constant contributors to the *Islāmic Review* are Professor Henri M. Leon, M.A., Ph.D., LL.D., F.S.P., A. Neville J. Whymant, Ph.D., Litt.D., F.S.P., and Mr. J. Parkinson. Altogether perhaps two hundred had announced their conversion by the end of 1917. A quotation from *The Islāmic Review* for January, 1916, will indicate what is involved in the acceptance of Islām in England to-day.

“The Brotherhood, being universal, is open to all, and anybody who would like to join it can either attend the Friday prayers at one p.m., at 39, Upper Bedford Place, London, W.C., on any Friday; or Sunday services, held at 3.15 p.m. at the Woking Mosque. Send the accompanying declaration to the Imām of the Mosque, Woking, Surrey, who will always be glad to answer any inquiries. Islām claims to be a rational faith, and undertakes to satisfy the reason and conscience both, so criticism is encouraged and every effort made to answer questions satisfactorily.

DECLARATION FORM

I son
daughter of
wife

of (address) do hereby faithfully and solemnly declare of my own free will that I adopt Islām as my religion; that I worship One and only Allah (God) alone; that I believe Muḥammad to be his messenger and servant; that I respect equally all prophets—Abraham, Moses, Jesus, etc.—that I will live a Muslim life by the help of Allah.

La ilaha ill-Allah,
Muḥammad al rasul-Allah.²

N.B.—Please address all inquiries to the Maulvī Ṣadr-ud-Dīn, B.A., B.T., Head of the Mosque, Woking, Surrey.³

¹ On December 9, 1916, Lord Headley was fined ten shillings, or seven days' imprisonment, at Tower Bridge Police Court, London, for being drunk and disorderly in Waterloo Road. The case was appealed, and at the County of London Sessions, on January 19, 1917, the appeal was dismissed with costs. See *The Glasgow Weekly Herald* for December 16, 1916, and January 20, 1917. See also Lord Headley's explanation in *Islāmic Review*, October 1917, Vol. V, p. 421.

² *I.e.*, *Kalima*. Cf. p. 104, Note 1.

³ Compare with the Form for Initiation into the Aḥmadiya Movement, in Appendix II.

Another quotation, from the issue of September, 1915, will illustrate the aspirations and dreams of the group at Woking:

"The time is approaching fast when God will no more remain an absurd mathematical problem, even in Christian lands. The time will come when Europe will be freed of its four curses of selfish materialism, drunkenness, gambling and licentiousness. The time will come when the Christian belief that woman was the cause of that sin with which, according to Christian nations, all mankind is permeated from birth, will die out. The time will come when innocent and angelic children, if they die unbaptized, will not be sent to perdition because of the crimes committed by their remotest possible ancestors, and if they live they will not be allowed to grow up with the demoralizing conviction in their minds that they were born sinners, and that their sins can only be cleansed by the blood of Christ. The time, in short, will come, and that, *Insha Allah*,¹ soon, when Islām will be accepted by the European nations as the religion which satisfies man's reason and conscience both. The time will come when in European countries Eid-ul-Fitr² and other Muslim festivals will no more remain novelties, and when the cry of *La ilaha illallah Muḥammad Rasūlallah* will be heard from high minarets five times every day from European cities."

This periodical is sent free to several thousand non-Muslims with the idea of interesting them in Islām, and the editors make it their boast that because of their work the Western mind has already been disabused of "such misrepresentation and misunderstanding which has been enveloping Islām and tarnishing its beauty for centuries." The same claim is made for a book by Lord Headley, entitled *A Western Awakening to Islām*,³ which is really a modified restatement (for the most part published previously in the *Islāmic Review*) of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad's glorification of Islām at the expense of Christianity.

At this writing an effort is being made to compass the erection of a mosque in the city of London itself, and Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn has spent considerable time in India arousing interest and securing funds throughout the

¹ I.e., "Please God."

² The 'Id-ul-Fitr is the feast which celebrates the end of the fast of Ramadān.

³ Right Hon. Lord Headley, B.A., etc., *A Western Awakening to Islām; Being the Result of Over Forty Years' Contemplation*, London 1915.

entire Indian Muḥammadan world (not simply from Ahmādīs, be it noted), on behalf of this project as well as of all the work of the Muḥammadan Mission in England, in which there are now several paid and many voluntary workers.

For the purpose of giving a résumé of the beliefs of the members of the Woking Mission there is included in Appendix IV, p. 147, a part of an editorial on "What is Islām?" which is taken from the *Islāmic Review*. The following subjects of articles that have appeared recently in that periodical, selected at random, will give an idea of the range and nature of its contents:

"A Muslim's Obligations to His Kinsmen," "Universal Brotherhood," "God and Science," "Haeckel and Islām," "Relative Position of Man and Woman in Islām," "The Age of the New Testament," "Christendom and Islām," "Islām," "Islām and Idolatry," "Misrepresentations of Missionaries," "Jesus Christ as Man and 'God'," "The Solidarity of Islām," "Islām and Civilization," "Who was the Founder of 'Church Religion' in the West?"

Regarding the financial condition of the Woking Mission, the receipts from Muslims in all parts of the world during the year 1917 totalled Rs. 26,765-8-3, and the expenditure was Rs. 31,963-6-0. These figures include the expenses involved in the publication of the *Islāmic Review*, a considerable enlargement of which is proposed in the near future.

CHAPTER VII

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE AḤMADĪYA MOVEMENT

IN considering the *raison d'être* of the Aḥmadiya movement, it is necessary to distinguish between the motive and the reasoning of its original leader, and the motives that have actuated those who have joined the sect both before and after the founder's death. In the case of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad himself, as in the case of his great master, Muḥammad, thirteen centuries earlier, a predominant influence leading to his assumption of the rôle of prophet was undoubtedly his overwhelming sense of the evil that was in the world, particularly, in Aḥmad's case, that part of the world which was nominally subject to Muḥammadan law and ethics. As he meditated upon this he was mindful of the tradition¹ that at the beginning of every hundred years a reviver (*Mujaddid*²) would appear, who should revivify Islām and restore it to the pure principles of its founder. Aḥmad's conviction that he had been chosen to fulfil a unique mission may well have had its inception in the growing consciousness, which appears early in his writings, that he was the divinely appointed reformer for the fourteenth century of the Muslim era.

Following this, through his contact with Christian missionaries and their claims and doctrines, a new Christian element was introduced into his thinking, and, from that time forward, occupied a far more prominent place in his mind than is the case with the average Muḥammadan

¹ See Ed. of *Iḥyā* of Al Ghazālī, with commentary of S. M., I, p. 26; and Goldziher, *Vorlesungen über den Islām*, p. 314

² Cf. p. 116.

teacher and preacher. He early recognized the importance of the unique place given to Jesus by Muḥammad, especially in the fact, as the Qur'ān is generally interpreted by Islām, that Jesus was taken up alive into heaven. Aḥmad saw that a live Jesus, whose tomb nowhere existed, and a dead Muḥammad, whose tomb at Medina was an object of pilgrimage for Muslims, gave Jesus an advantage of which Christian missionaries might have made far more use than they had. After Aḥmad had reflected upon these things and discussed them with Muslim and Christian friends, the revelations began to come, as described in the first chapter, giving to Aḥmad all the honours which Muslims usually ascribe to Jesus, and most of those conferred by Muslim "agreement" upon Muḥammad. From all classes of Muslims he sought acknowledgment as the "next step" in the divine revelation, which came, in time, to mean that he was not only the reformer of the present generation, but that he was also the fulfiller of all the apocalyptic hopes of Muslims—those looking toward the Maḥdi as well as to the promised Messiah. Then, even as Muḥammad from believing that he was sent specially to his own followers came to regard himself as appointed to a more universal mission, Aḥmad extended his claims to other religions as well, declaring that his revelation was to all mankind, to the Christian and the Hindu as well as to the Muslim. But here the difficulty of Jesus' ascension into heaven in his earthly body, according to both Muslim and Christian ideas, had to be conclusively dealt with by Aḥmad, since, were Jesus really alive in such a unique manner, which did not hold true of Muḥammad and the other prophets, it would be expected that his return would be supernatural in character, in which case Aḥmad would have no ground for his claim to Messiahship. Aḥmad accepted the issue by boldly and repeatedly declaring that if the commonly accepted view of Jesus' ascension was true, he (Aḥmad) was an imposter; and we have seen how earnestly he sought to prove that orthodox Muslims and Christians were wrong, through his revelation declaring that Jesus died an ordinary death and was buried in Srinagar, Kashmir. The efforts of his

later years were divided between urging the proofs of his various claims to unique eminence, building up the new community centring in Qādiān, and giving in his lectures and writings the spiritual interpretation of Muḥammadan teachings which he held to be needful for the revitalizing of the Muslim world. His proposal, just before his death, to form a union of the Ārya Samāj, Hinduism and Islām, was the climax of his life's activities.

To understand the motives of those Muslims¹ who have joined the movement—other than those who were attracted by the personality of the founder and immediately and blindly accepted his judgments and revelations as valid, without any use whatever of their reasoning faculties—it is necessary to survey briefly the recent development of Islām in India. Dating roughly from the beginning of the nineteenth century, there came to the religious thought and life of India, moribund for so many centuries, a notable awakening and advance, due, as Dr. Farquhar has shown,² to the co-operation of three forces—the British Government in India, Protestant Christian Missions and, at a later period, the work of the great Western orientalists. The Muḥammadan community in India (comprising more than sixty millions of the three hundred odd million inhabitants) was the last large unit of the population to feel and respond to this new stimulus, as it was farthest behind in education and culture. It was their great progressive leader, Syed Aḥmad Khān,³ of Delhi and Aligarh, who first realised that the Muslims must join the Bengalis, Marāthas, Parsis, and other races and communities, in seeking to assimilate the results of Western scholarship, and, where necessary, to adapt their religious ideas and practices to fit the new environment created by the influx of British civilians, Christian missionaries and oriental scholars. He advised his fellow-Muslims in India to eschew political

¹ The number of Hindus and Christians who have become Aḥmadīs in India and other countries is so small as to be negligible for our present purpose of estimating the significance of the sect.

² *Modern Religious Movements in India*, p. 5.

³ See p. 66, Note 1.

controversy, and, thankfully recognizing the advantages afforded to Islām in India by the presence of the British Government, to seek in every way to advance the cause of education and social reform within their own ranks. In his residential college, at Aligarh, Western arts and sciences were taught by European scholars along with the religious instruction given by Sunnite and Shī'ite maulvīs. To the utter abomination of the orthodox, he mingled freely in English society, even dining with English ladies and gentlemen in their homes, and in his periodical, *Tahzih'ul Akhlāq* ("Reform of Morals"), he urged upon his community the importance of female education and enfranchisement, and of other advanced reforms. In religious matters he was a liberal and a rationalist, going so far as to place the Christian Bible on a par with the Qur'ān, as no less, and no more, inspired, holding that the Bible has not been corrupted by the Christians, and that in the Qur'ān, as in the Bible, there is a human as well as a divine element. He also wrote part of a commentary on the book of Genesis. One of his watchwords was, "Reason alone is a sufficient guide," and he quoted with approval the remark of a French writer, that Islām, which lays no claim to miraculous powers on the part of the founder, is the truly rationalistic religion.¹ As Goldziher has pointed out² this represents a return to the old Mu'tazilite position,³ and in its universalistic outlook upon other religions is akin to Bābism in Persia, which arose at about the same period.

Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān and his followers, then, represent the first development of Indian Islām, under the stimulus of its contact with Western ideas, and it would be difficult to exaggerate the profound influence of this movement on the articulate section of the Muḥammadan world of India. In the second stage we pass from what Dr. Farquhar calls "movements favouring vigorous reform," to those in which reform is checked by defence of

¹ See Weitbrecht, *Indian Islām and Modern Thought*, Church Congress, 1905.

² *Vorlesungen über den Islām*, p. 313.

³ Cf. p. 65, Note 3; and p. 123, Note 1.

the old faiths, from the atmosphere of the theistic Brāhma Samāj, of Ram Mohan Roy and Keshub Chandra Sen, to that of the largely reactionary and strongly anti-Christian Ārya Samāj of Dayānand Saraswatī. Such well-known living Muslims as Syed Amīr ‘Alī and Maulvī Chirāgh ‘Alī represent this school of thought, which in its Muḥammadanism is as rationalistic as Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān, but in its attitude toward other faiths is much more dogmatic and less tolerant. These writers are greatly concerned to prove that the reforms—religious, social, moral and political—which have been forced upon Islām by pressure from without are really in line with the original *spirit* of Islām, however much Muḥammadan tradition, law and present-day practice may actually oppose them. Furthermore, they declare that the real Islām is the universal religion of the future, because it meets sinful man on the lower level of his practical, everyday life, instead of holding up, as does Christianity (*sic*), ideals impossible of attainment. This probably represents that “side development of Islām” to which Professor Macdonald alludes in *Aspects of Islām*,¹ when he writes: “Or are the wheels of progress to crush out all ideals, and is the future civilization of the world to be woven of philosophic doubt, of common-sense attitudes and of material luxury? There is a curious side development of Islām which looks in that direction, and which sees in the narrowed, utilitarian aims, in the acceptance of the lower facts of life, in the easy ideals which characterize that religion, the promise that its will be the future in the common-sense world to come, and holds that, even as the world is, Islām must be the religion of all sensible men.”

Syed Amīr ‘Alī seems to hold that view of Islām, in its essence, only insisting that Muḥammad’s practical rules assist morality more than do general precepts; and yet admitting that in order to the wide acceptance of Islām in the West certain modifications of its requirements are essential. In *The Spirit of Islām* he has written: “The Islām of Muḥammad, with its stern discipline and its severe morality, has proved itself the only practical religion for low

¹ Pp. 256, 257.

natures, to save them from drifting into lawless materialism. It is probable, however, that should the creed of the Arabian Prophet receive acceptance among European communities, much of the rigid formalism which has been imparted to it by the lawyers of Central Asia and Irāk will have to be abandoned."¹

Thus has reform passed over into apologetic, as, in the main thesis of Syed Amīr 'Alī's book, it advances to polemic and straightforward attack essential to the assertion, on this new ground, of the superiority of Islām over Christianity. As Syed Amīr 'Alī and Maulvī Chirāgh 'Alī have departed from the policy of Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān in the latter's unpolemical religious eclecticism, the vigorous group of Muslims composing the All-India Moslem League² has departed from it in a different direction in their active championship of the political rights and ambitions of the Muslims of India in the present day. The editor of the defunct *Comrade* (the organ of this group), Muḥammad 'Alī, by reason of his seditious articles and utterances, was interned by the British Government, together with his brother and a number of other prominent Muslims, soon after the commencement of the war with Germany.

We come now to the Aḥmadiya movement, which represents on the religious side a further departure from Sir Syed Aḥmad's position, in the matter of religious liberalism, but is a return to it, though on different grounds,³ in the matter of the absence of political controversy. The rationalism of all the newer school is utterly repudiated by Aḥmad, as we have seen, and there is present here a zeal for reform more analogous to the Wāhhābītes than to any other modern party of Muslims. It represents a later stage of the reaction to a Christianity by this time established and rapidly winning converts. It has attracted those Muslims who, concerned alike at the inroads of Christianity and (to a small extent) of the Ārya Samāj from without, and of rationalism and worldliness from within, turned eagerly toward a leader who took his

¹ Preface, p. xii.

² Cf. p. 114.

³ Cf. p. 103.

stand firmly upon Islām as a revealed religion, as being the supreme revelation of God to man, and, allowing no quarter to Christianity, pressed forward in unsparing attack, not, however, asserting the superiority of Islām on the ground of its rational character, but rather because of the authentic and conclusive nature of its divinely inspired revelation. Accordingly, following in this Syed Amīr ‘Alī rather than Sir Syed Aḥmad, Western civilization, as well as the Christian religion, is generally and heartily condemned.

Undoubtedly one element which helped to convince many Muslims of the validity of Aḥmad’s claim to be the medium of revelation in our day was his theory regarding the death of Jesus, which brought them relief from the predicament in which they had hitherto been placed in religious controversy with Christians. This reason for success is frankly set forth in a recent article by Aḥmad’s son, the present *Khalīfa*, which is the substance of a letter sent by him to the Nizām of Hyderabad :

“The chief reason why the reformer of this age was given the title of Messiah was that he was destined to fight against ‘Church Christianity’ and to break its power, and as an actual fact the instruments which the reformer used towards this end were such as were altogether beyond the power of the Christians to face. For example, it was the practice of the Christians to take in Musalmāns by such arguments as the following:—‘Mark, how our Messiah is still alive while your prophet is dead.’ ‘Our Messiah used to bring the dead to life. Your prophet did not bring any dead to life.’ ‘Our Messiah is sitting in the sky, your prophet lies buried under the sand.’ ‘Your prophet will not visit the earth again, but our Messiah will once more come to the earth to purge it of its corruptions, and it is he who will overthrow the perils of the latter days.’ ‘Now, say truly, which of the two is superior?’ The argument was such as could not possibly be escaped by the Musalmāns and most of them fell a prey to the deception. What the reformer did was to establish by powerful arguments the falsity of all such notions. He thus saved Musalmāns from the clutches of the Christians. . . . By proving that Jesus died a natural death, the new reformer gave a fresh lease of life to Islām, and now the Musalmāns are for all times saved from falling a prey to the Christian missionaries” (*Review of Religions*, XV, p. 9).

A further powerful element of attractiveness in the Aḥmadiya movement is its appeal to the age-long eschato-

logical hopes of Muslims, held to some extent in common with earnest adherents of most of the great religious communions of the world. It is on this side that it is distantly related to the Bābī and Bahā'ī movements, from which it differs essentially, as we have already seen,¹ in the matter of its exclusiveness and intolerance, insisting, as it does, not on the oneness of all religions, but rather on the unique supremacy of Islām as interpreted by Aḥmad. The late Dr. S. G. Wilson, author of *Bahā'ism and Its Claims*, for thirty-two years a missionary in Persia, traces the parallelism between the two movements, in eschatological and other directions, in part as follows:²

“In this effort to propagate itself in Christendom (referring to the Mission at Woking, England), it is like Bahā'ism. In not a few points there is a striking resemblance between these offshoots from Muḥammadanism. Some of these may be accounted for by their springing up in a similar soil, a Muḥammadan soil impregnated with Sūfism and Mahdism, and in which some elements of nineteenth century Christian thought had found lodgment. Both (Aḥmad and Bahā'Ullah) claim that a new revelation is needed, because Christianity is dead and Islām needs reforming. . . . Both, after the example of Muḥammad, sent letters to kings announcing their coming and inviting them to faith. Both practised polygamy and praised Muḥammad and the Koran. Both belittled Jesus Christ, denying his miracles, his resurrection, his ascension and literal Second Coming. Both failed to bring about moral reformation in the conduct of their disciples, who have divided into sects on the death of their founders. Both claimed as signs of their mission their eloquence in the Arabic tongue, the writing of spontaneous verses, fulfilled predictions, their success in winning converts, and the good effects seen in the conduct of their followers. Both made large use of the press; Bahā'Ullah sent his books to Bombay to be published, owing to lack of liberty in Turkey and Persia; Ghulām Aḥmad had a press of his own at Qādiān. The teachings of Aḥmad are free from some of the extravagances and inanities of Bahā'ism. Neither sect appears to have any great future before it. Their chief usefulness has been to help towards the breaking down of scholastic Islām—the one among the Shi'āhs, the other among the Sunnis of India. Bahā'ism has definitely broken with Islām, while the Aḥmadiya movement continues within its fold.”

While all the reasons given above help to explain the measure of success attained by the Aḥmadiya movement,

¹ Cf. p. 53.

² *Modern Movements Among Moslems*, Fleming H. Revell, N.Y., 1916, pp. 138, 139.

it is chiefly significant as giving added evidence of the craving of the human heart everywhere for a real and vitalizing religious life. It has shown how many Indian Muslims there are who could not rest satisfied with a rationalistic faith, on the one hand, nor with mere empty orthodoxy combined with formal worship, on the other. My visit to Qādiān, in January, 1916, although it took place more than eight years after the death of Aḥmad, showed me a community where there existed abundant enthusiasm and zeal for religion, of a vigorous, positive kind unusual in Islām in India at the present time. One could understand how an earnest Muslim who had come to feel a species of contempt for the ignorant, unfaithful maulvīs of his acquaintance, a Muslim to whom Muḥammad seemed a long way back, historically, and Mecca a long way off, geographically, would find in the spirit of industry, confidence and aggressiveness to be encountered at Qādiān a heartening faith for which he had looked in vain to orthodox relatives and priests. We can understand how he would thankfully accept as true the revelations of the Mirzā Ṣāhib, without subjecting their content to the scrutiny of a trained intellect, partly because his pragmatic mind could see that here was something that *worked*, and partly because of his not being one of the rare few in the Muslim world who as yet have attained to fair and critical judgment in matters affecting the religious life.

The split in the sect, following the death of the first *Khalīfa*, shows the counter effect upon the community of the strong present-day rationalistic and political elements in Indian Muḥammadanism, pressing in upon the minds of educated Aḥmadīs like Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn and his fellow-seceders. They are so far men of affairs in the world that they could not wholly give themselves over to that absorption in religious matters which is characteristic of the Qādiān party. As already related, their secession tended naturally to accentuate in the members of the true Aḥmadīya remnant their belief in supernatural religion and their loyalty to the unique claims of their revered leader. How the faces of these loyal Aḥmadīs are turning more and more toward Qādiān as a second Medīna, not

to say Mecca, is evident from the following paragraph in the *Review of Religions* for January, 1917 (XV, p. 41) :

“More than five thousand delegates, from almost all the parts of India, attended the annual gathering of Aḥmadīs, and the meetings held on the 26th, 27th, and 28th December were a complete success. His Holiness the Second Successor to the Promised Messiah spoke on the remembrance of God, for five hours, and His Hazrat's¹ impressive, interesting and instructive sermon was listened to with rapt attention by the spell-bound assembly of the faithful, who returned home with increased knowledge and refreshed faith. There was also a ladies' conference, about five hundred ladies being present. The blessed town of Qādiān this year witnessed the truth of the Promised Messiah's great prophecy about this place, with even greater splendour and grandeur than before, and everyone, with the praise of Allah on his lips, involuntarily sang the following couplet of the Messiah— ‘The place of Qādiān is now honoured, and with the gathering together of people resembles the sacred precincts of the Ka'ba.’ ”

It now appears certain that the Lahore party will be absorbed into the “All-India Moslem League” section of Indian Islām, contributing to it a certain added anti-Christian *animus* and, in part perhaps, the new Aḥmadiya interpretation of the death of Jesus, whereas the Qādiān party will continue as a permanent, and possibly a gradually widening, segment of the great circle of Islām.

¹ “Lordship” or “Excellency.”

AḤMADĪYA BIBLIOGRAPHY

- H. D. Griswold—*Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad, the Meḥdi-Messiah of Qādiān*, Ludhiana, 1902.
- G. L. Thakur Dass—*The "Greatest Discovery" Exploded*, Ludhiana, 1903.
- Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad—*The Teachings of Islām*, London, 1910.
- Right Hon. Lord Headley—*A Western Awakening to Islām*, London, 1915.
- H. D. Griswold—"The Aḥmadiya Movement," *Moslem World*, 11, p. 373ff.
- H. A. Walter—"The Aḥmadiya Movement To-day," *Moslem World*, VI, ff.
- R. Sirāj-ud-Dīn—"Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad, a False Messiah of India," *Missionary Review of the World*, New Series, XX, p. 749ff.
- M. T. Houtsma—"Aḥmadiya," in *Revue du Monde Musulman*, I, p. 333ff.
- H. A. Walter—"Qādiāni," in *Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, X.
- T. M. Arnold—*Acts du XII me Congris Internat. des Orientalistes*, Rome, 1899, III, 1, p. 139ff.
- Ignaz Goldziher—*Vorlesungen über den Islām*, Heidelberg, 1910, p. 313ff.
- J. N. Farquhar—*Modern Religious Movements in India*, New York, 1915, p. 137ff.
- S. G. Wilson—*Modern Movements Among Moslems*, New York, 1916, p. 132ff.
- Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad—*Barāhin-i-Aḥmadiya*, Qādiān, 1880.
- The Review of Religions*, Qādiān, monthly since 1902.
- The Islāmic Review and Muslim India*, Woking, monthly since 1912.
- Government of India Census Reports, 1901 and 1911.
- Numerous books, periodicals and controversial pamphlets in the vernacular.

APPENDIX I

Excerpts from article, entitled "Revelation," by Chaudri Fateh Muhammad Sayal, M.A., in Review of Religions, November, 1916:

"Revelations begin in dreams, as it is related of Prophet Muhammad. His wife says that at first the prophet used to have beautiful dreams, and their fulfilment was as sure as day follows night. The same has been told by Ahmad about himself in his life. He first used to see true dreams and clear visions before he received verbal revelations containing grand prophecies. It is quite intelligible that it should be so, for in order that the spiritual sense should be able to work in its initial stages it is necessary that all the other senses should be at rest. It is a common experience that all the senses cannot work their best at the same time. When a man with strong spiritual powers has a dream, probably he does not notice it at first, but when he sees that the dreams he has are often fulfilled, he becomes curious about them and begins to remember them in order to see if they are fulfilled or not. He finds to his surprise that they are fulfilled with wonderful accuracy, which is beyond the power of hallucination. By this time the spiritual sense has grown stronger by use, and visions are seen in a light sleep, then in a semi-waking state, and finally when a person is wide awake. This is all done to save the prophet from doubt, surprise or shock. The frequency of the visions and their fulfilment convinces him of the working of the spiritual sense to such an extent that he proclaims this among other people and has the courage of conviction to say, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but the word of my mouth shall not pass away.' And the Holy Qur'ân says, 'It is as sure as your own speech.' After a long experience of this kind,

when a person sees a future event in a vision, or is otherwise informed of it through his spiritual sense, he has no hesitation in claiming that that event shall occur as shown to him. The difference between prophecy and surmise is the same as between certainty and expectation. Of course, a future event may be shown in an allegorical manner, but the repeated experience of the person who sees it will explain the allegory to him. Progressing from this state, revelation becomes clearer; a piece of writing may appear before the eyes, one may hear words as if spoken from the other side of a curtain, or each separate word may strike the heart as a hammer strikes the gong. Sometimes a sort of electric influence passes through the whole body, and all physical powers are suspended for a time, and the prophet utters some words which he knows are not his own. At first the revelations are very short, but as time goes on they become longer, and more frequent. This is the reason why the Prophet Muḥammad had very short verses revealed to him at first, but as time went on, and he became accustomed to receive revelations, the verses became longer and were revealed more frequently.

“Further on, I let Aḥmad speak on this difficult subject.

“ ‘It is also one of the signs of the perfect one that Almighty God makes his tongue utter sweet and eloquent divine words, which have in them a divine awe, divine blessings and wonderful power of revealing deep secrets of the future. Such words are accompanied with a light which shows with certainty that the words proceed from a divine source, and there is not the slightest doubt about their divine origin. There is in these words a divine brilliance, and they are free from all impurities. In most cases they reveal a grand prophecy. The prophecies so revealed relate to a great variety of subjects and in all respects they are unparalleled. They are distinguished from the predictions made by astrologists by the signs of belovedness and acceptance which are the chief characteristics. There are in them the good tidings of divine assistance and help to the recipient of the divine revelation. These matters are revealed to him, which are not revealed to others, and his prophecies disclose these deep secrets of the future which are not met with elsewhere. Such is, in short, the blessing which is granted to the tongue of the perfect one in the utterance of unparalleled words.

“ ‘His eye is also granted an unparalleled power of vision, and the perfect one can see objects hidden from ordinary sight. Sometimes

writings are brought before his eyes which have no existence in the outside world. He can see the dead, and talk with them as if they were living. Sometimes things at a distance of thousands of miles come before him in such a manner as if they were in his ken.

“ ‘His ear is also granted the faculty of hearing voices which ordinary ears cannot hear. Very often he hears the voices of the angels, and in moments of affliction and restlessness finds comfort from them. He can also hear voices of material things, vegetables and animals. His heart is granted a supernatural power of judgment and discernment.

“ ‘Similarly a blessing is granted to his hands and feet and his whole body, and it often happens that his mere touch cures many diseases.

“ ‘ . . . It (the revelation) often takes the form of question and answer. A man puts a question and receives an answer from God, and this process is repeated several times. During the times that the answer is communicated to him, he is under the influence of a sort of slumber. But the mere utterance of certain words in a state of slumber is no evidence of their divine origin.

“ ‘It sometimes comes in languages quite unknown to the person to whom it is revealed.’ ”¹

¹ A common experience with mediums.

APPENDIX II

FORM FOR INITIATION INTO THE AḤMADĪYA MOVEMENT

To

HAZARAT KHALIFATUL MESIH II,
MIRZA BASHIR-UD-DIN MAHMUD AHMAD SAHIB.

MOST REVEREND SIR,

Peace be with you. I have gone through the conditions of *Bai'āt*, the Articles of Faith, the Duties of Aḥmadīs and General Instructions, and have accepted them. I, having filled up the sub-joined form, send it to you and pray that my Bai'āt may be accepted.

I bear witness that there is no God but Allah. He is one, having no partner, and Muḥammad is the servant and messenger of God.

I son of enter the Aḥmadiya Movement at the hands of MAHMUD, and ask pardon for all my sins. In future I will try my best to guard myself against all kinds of sins. I will never set up equals to God and will give precedence to my religion before all worldly considerations. I will try my best to act upon all the laws of Islām. I will always try to learn, teach or hear the Holy Qur'ān and the traditions. I will consider the propagation of Islām as the first of my duties. I will obey you in everything good that you will tell me. I consider our Lord Muḥammad (peace be upon him) to be the seal of prophets, and believe in all the claims of the Promised Messiah.

(Arabic Characters.)

I beg pardon from Allah my Lord for all my sins, and turn to him.
I beg pardon from Allah my Lord and turn to him.

(Arabic Characters.)

O my Lord I have wronged my soul, and I confess all my sins.
Pray forgive my sins, and there is no forgiver except thee.

O my Lord I have wronged my soul, and I confess all my sins.
Pray forgive my sins, and there is no forgiver except thee.

O my Lord I have wronged my soul, and I confess all my sins.
Pray forgive my sins, and there is no forgiver except thee.

Amen ! Amen !

Signature

APPENDIX III

CONDITION OF BAI'AT (INITIATION INTO THE AḤMADĪYA MOVEMENT)¹

The man who accepts *Bai'āt* should firmly make up his mind :—

Firstly, that up to the day of his death he will abstain from *Shirk*, *i.e.*, setting up equals to God.

Secondly, that he will keep away from falsehood, adultery, looking at women other than near relatives, cruelty, dishonesty, riot and rebellion, and, in short, every kind of evil : and will not allow himself to be carried away by his passions, however strong they may be.

Thirdly, that he will pray five times a day without fail, according to the commands of Allah and his Apostle, and to the best of his ability will try to offer his Tahajjud prayers (prayer of the latter part of the night), to invoke the blessings of God (*Durūd*) upon his prophet, to ask pardon for his sins and the help of God; and that, remembering the blessings of God, he will always praise him.

Fourthly, that he will in no way harm God's creatures generally, and Moslems particularly, under the influence of his passions—neither with his hands, nor with his tongue, nor by any other means.

Fifthly, that in every state of sorrow or pleasure, prosperity or adversity, felicity or misfortune, he will prove himself faithful to God, and that in every condition he will accept the decree of God, and in this way he will be ready to bear every kind of insult and pain. At the time of any misfortune he will never turn away from him, but rather he will advance further.

Sixthly, that he will not follow vulgar customs and will abstain from evil inclination, and that he will completely submit to the authority of the Holy Qur'ān, and that he will make the sayings of God and his Apostle the guiding principle of his life.

Seventhly, that he will fully give up pride and haughtiness, and will pass his days with humility, lowliness, courtesy and meekness.

Eighthly, that he will consider religion, the dignity of religion and the well-being of Islām dearer than life, wealth and children, and, in short, dearer than everything else.

¹ Obtainable in pamphlet form at the Qādiān headquarters.

Ninthly, that he will be for God's sake showing sympathy with his creatures of Allah, and to the best of his power he will use his natural abilities for the welfare of God's creatures.

Tenthly, that he will establish a brotherhood with me (the promised Messiah) on condition of obeying me in everything good, and keep it up to the day of his death, and this relationship will be of such a high order that its example will not be found in any worldly relationship, either of blood relations or of servant and master.

The Articles of Faith of the Ahmadiya Community.

1. God is one, and nobody is or can be his co-sharer in his self, attributes, names or worship.

2. The angels exist.

3. God has been sending from time immemorial his apostles in every country and nation for the guidance of his creatures, and we believe in every one of them whose names have been mentioned in the Holy Qur'ān individually and in the rest collectively.

4. Our Book is the Holy Qur'ān and our prophet is Muḥammad (peace be upon him), and he is the seal of prophets.

5. The door of inspiration has always been, and will always be, open, and no attribute of God ever becomes useless. As he used to hold communion with his good servants, so he does even now, and will continue to do up to the end of the world.

6. This is our firm faith that divine decree (taqdīr) as enunciated by the Holy Qur'ān is correct, and that God listens to and accepts the prayers of his creatures, and great deeds are achieved by means of prayer.

7. We believe in the rising of the human beings after their death, and also we firmly believe that the heaven and the hell, as described by the Qur'ān and the Traditions, exist and that on the day of Resurrection our prophet Muḥammad will be the intercessor.

8. We firmly believe that the man about whom prophecies have been made by the old prophets under different names and of whom the Holy Qur'ān speaks in the verse, "He it is who raised a prophet amongst the Meccans . . . and among others of them who have not yet overtaken them," as the second advent of our Lord Muḥammad, and whom our Lord Muḥammad calls Messiah the prophet and the Maḥdī (the man), is Hazrat Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Qādiān, and besides him nobody is the promised Messiah.

9. It is our firm belief that the Holy Qur'ān is a perfect book and that no new law will be required till the day of Resurrection, and that our Lord Muḥammad possesses collectively all the qualities of all the prophets, and that after him none can, far from gaining any spiritual eminence, ever become a true believer except by complete obedience to him. We, not for a moment, believe that any old prophet will come to this place a second time, because in that we will have to admit some defect in the spiritual powers of our Lord Muḥammad—but we believe among his followers Reformers have appeared, and will continue to appear, with spiritual knowledge of a very high order.

Not only this, but a man can even gain prophethood by the help of our Lord Muḥammad's spiritual powers. But no prophet with a new book or having been appointed direct will ever come; for in this case it would be an insult to the perfect prophethood of our Lord, and this is the meaning of the seal of prophets, and in this sense the Lord has on the one hand said, "There is no prophet (*i.e.*, an independent prophet or a prophet with a new law) after me," and on the other hand has called the coming Messiah a prophet of God.

10. According to this we believe that a man, the Promised Messiah, has gained prophethood in spite of his being a follower of our Lord. We believe in the miracles of the prophets, which, in the words of the Qur'ān, are called signs of God, and this is our firm faith that God, for the manifestation of his glory and for proving the truth of his apostles, has been, through his servants, showing signs which are beyond the power of human beings.

The Duties of the Aḥmadiya Community.

The Aḥmadiya community is neither an Anjuman nor is it a religion. But the meaning of the Aḥmadiya movement is this, that it is a body of Moslems that, having recognised the Promised Messiah as a means of guidance, have accepted the true Islām, which was given to the world through our Lord Muḥammad, and who have accepted all the claims of the last messenger of God, *viz.*, the Promised Messiah. Hence the obligations of the Ahmadis are the same as have been fixed by the Holy Qur'ān for a Muslim, and which have been sanctioned by the usage and practice of our Lord Muḥammad and his companions. Hence, acting upon the laws of the Qur'ān, the practices and sayings of the Prophet is a distinct duty of every Aḥmadi. But since Islām considers the proclamation of the truth as one of the important duties of a Muslim, and it has been considered as one of the distinguishing features of the Muslims that they ask the people to do good and prohibit from doing evil—a duty the performance of which made the Muslims so successful in the beginning, hence the Promised Messiah has laid much stress upon this point, and has made it obligatory for the members of the community that they should send a part of their income to Qādiān for this purpose. This money is spent for the propagation of Islām on the lines fixed by the Promised Messiah. Hence every Aḥmadi should make it a rule for himself to send a part of his income for the furtherance of the objects of the movement. The amount of this contribution has not been fixed, but left to be determined by the love and zeal of a man for the movement. Be the sum small or great, it is obligatory on every Aḥmadi to help the movement with his mite. Some friends spend one-tenth, and even more, of their income for the help of their religion.

The Management of the Aḥmadiya Movement.

As has been the custom of God from time immemorial that he starts a line of successors for looking after the welfare of the

community which is prepared by the messengers of God, so in this age too he has started a line of successors. Without it no progress is possible, for a disorganised body is incapable of performing anything great. Hence, for the purpose of keeping the community united, and for using its potentialities collectively for the welfare of Islām, a line of successors has been started. This is our firm conviction, as it is also mentioned in Chapter XXIV, p. 55, that successors are appointed by God. Hence it is the duty of every Ahmadi, as long as it pleases God to favour us with this blessing, to accept the Bai'at of the caliphs, one after another.

All the new converts should also enter into the Bai'at of the successors to the Promised Messiah, or their representatives. But if any man for any reason cannot personally come to Qādiān he may also enter into the Bai'at by means of a letter. At present there are two Anjumans—(a) Ṣadr-Anjuman Ahmadiya, (b) Anjuman Taraqqī Islām—under the Khalīfatul Māsīh for carrying on the work of the movement. The Ṣadr-Anjuman Ahmadiya, according to the instructions of the Promised Messiah and in consultation with the Khalīfatul Māsīh, looks after the executive and educational necessities of the community. Among some of the most important duties of this Anjuman is looking after the comforts of the guests who come to Qādiān, maintaining schools for the secular and religious instruction of the community, carrying out the instructions contained in the Will of the Promised Messiah, and conducting the *Review of Religions*. But as the propagation of Islām requires special attention, hence the Anjuman Taraqqī Islām busies itself with this work. Those friends who send their contributions, generally point out how much is to be given to the Ṣadr-Anjuman and how much is to be allotted to the Taraqqī Islām. As *zakāt* (legal alms) should be kept in the Bait-ul-Māl (the treasury) so everyone on whom *zakāt* is compulsory sends it to Qādiān. It is collected by the Anjuman Taraqqī Islām, and spent according to the instructions of the successor to the Promised Messiah. As it is necessary for the progress of the movement to keep in touch with the centre, hence, according to the instructions of the Promised Messiah, an annual gathering of the community is held by the end of the month of December every year. This gathering is attended by the members of the community from every part of the country. In these meetings means are devised for strengthening the faith of the Ahmadiya community and for enlarging its mission work. This should be attended by every member of the community. Besides, friends should also from time to time try to come to Qādiān, and should write letters to the Khalīfatul Māsīh (successor to the Promised Messiah) every now and then, for in this way the Khalīfatul Māsīh feels an inclination to pray for the writer, and besides, the welfare of the different members of the community also becomes known. The first Khalīfa of the Promised Messiah was the late Hazrat Maulvi Nūr-ud-Dīn Sāhib, and the present Khalīfa is Hazrat Mīrzā Bashir-ud-Dīn Maḥmūd Aḥmad Sāhib.

Some Instructions for the New Aḥmadīs

Since the Promised Messiah was a messenger of God, and the denying of the Apostles of God is a dangerous boldness and deprives a man of faith, hence, according to the Qur'ān, the Traditions of the seal of prophets, and the sayings of the Promised Messiah, it is the duty of every Aḥmadī that he should pray under the leadership of Aḥmadī Imāms only. But in those places where Aḥmadī Imāms can not be found, he should offer his prayers alone, and should pray to God to give him a Jamā'at, or Society, of his own, because a true believer can never remain alone. Similarly, it has been prohibited that Aḥmadīs should give their daughters in marriage to non-Aḥmadīs, for wives are generally influenced by their husbands, and thus it is making a soul apostate. Likewise, Aḥmadīs should not attend the funeral service of non-Aḥmadīs, for it would amount to interceding to God for a man who has proved himself an enemy by denying and opposing the Promised Messiah.

APPENDIX IV

WHAT IS ISLAM ?¹

Islām is a simple faith. A belief in One and only God (Allah), possessing all the conceivable good attributes and absolutely free from all frailties, is its first principle. Those who follow *Islām* are called Muslims or Musalmāns, but not Muḥammadans. They worship One God—the All-mighty, the All-knowing, the All-just, the Cherisher of the Worlds, the Master of the East and the West, the Author of the Heavens and Earth, the Creator of all that exists. The God of *Islām* is Loving and Forgiving, but also just and swift in reckoning. He is the Friend; the Guide; the Helper. Every place is sacred to him. There is none like him. He has no partner or co-sharer. He has begotten no sons or daughters. He is free from passions, and is indivisible, impersonal. From him all have come and to him all return. He is the Light of the Heaven and the Earth, the Glorious, the Magnificent, the Beautiful, the Eternal, the Infinite, the First and the Last.

The Prophet of Islām was Muḥammad, whom the Muslims must follow. He was the last Prophet, and finally and faithfully preached and established the doctrine of the Unity of God in a way that it can never now be shaken by any amount of progress of rationalism. Those who believe in the doctrine of the unity of God are expected to respect his servant and messenger, who established that doctrine. Muḥammad is highly revered by all the Muslims, but is recognized as a man, as are other Prophets, like Abraham, Moses, Jesus, etc., who are all respected by Muslims as righteous persons sent down by the loving God to guide his children. All the Prophets, whether of the East or the West, the North or the South, brought the same common message from the Creator, but their followers afterwards altered or corrupted it, until Muḥammad came, who left behind him an uncorruptible book.

The Gospel of Muslims is Al-Qur'ān. It teaches man how to hold direct communion with his Maker, and also how to deal with his fellow-beings as well as God's other creatures. It has enjoined, "Be constant in prayer, for prayer preserveth from crimes and from that which is blamable, and the remembrance of Allah is surely a most sacred duty." But it has also said, "Blessed are they who fulfil the covenant of God and break not their compact; and who join

¹ From an editorial in the *Islāmic Review*, IV, pp. 248-250.

together what God hath bidden to be joined; and who fear their Lord and dread an ill-reckoning; and who from a sincere desire to please their Lord are constant amid trials, and observe prayers, and give alms in secret and openly, out of what we have bestowed on them; and turn aside evil with good; for them there is the recompense of that abode, gardens of eternal habitation, into which they shall enter, together with such as shall have acted rightly from among their fathers; their wives and their posterity and the angels shall go in unto them by every portal (saying), 'Peace be with you; because you have endured with patience' " (Sura xiii, 20-24).

Al-Qur'ān is a book which has withstood the ravages of time, and stands to-day, after more than thirteen centuries, word for word and letter for letter as it came out of the mouth of the Prophet Muḥammad. There are hundreds of thousands of Muslims who know the whole of it by heart. It is an uncorrupted and a living book, and the religion it preaches is a living religion.

There is No Priesthood in Islām. There is no intercession, no redemption, no saviourship. Every soul is responsible for its own actions. Islām points out both the ways—the one which brings to God, and that is *good*; the other which leads away from him, and that is *evil*. No one can carry the burden of the other. Sincere repentance secures forgiveness. "O My servants, who have transgressed to your own injury, despair not of Allah's mercy, for all sins doth Allah forgive; gracious and merciful is He" (Qur'ān, Chap. XXXIX, 54).

Islām does not recognize any difference of sex in piety. Whether males or females, those who act rightly get their salvation. It does not lay down that human beings are born sinners, or that woman was instrumental in the "fall of Adam." The holy Prophet has said, "Paradise lies at the feet of mother."

Islām forbids impurity of every kind. Cleanliness, both of body and mind, is essential for a Muslim. Physical cleanliness is a natural concomitant to the idea of moral purity, for no man can approach him who is All Pure and Clean in a state of uncleanness. All intoxicants are forbidden, so is gambling and the flesh of the pig. Suicide is practically unknown among Muslims.

Islām enjoins prayers, fixed alms to the needy, fasting, affection to parents, and kindness to all creatures—even animals and birds.

Islām encourages rational views and scientific research, by declaring that sun and moon and all the elements are subservient to human intellect and will in a great measure, and man can utilize them if he discovers the secret of those laws according to which they work.

APPENDIX V

THE MISSION TO ENGLAND

The following popular account of a Muslim service in London, in connection with Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn's British mission, which was clipped from the *New York Times* of December 21, 1913, may be of interest. Nawāb Zafar 'Alī Khān, here referred to, was the editor of a Lahore Muslim paper, the *Zamindār*, the publication of which was suspended by the Panjab Government, because of its political activities, after the beginning of the war :

PEER AT MOSLEM SERVICE

OTHER CONVERTS TO MUHAMMADANISM ARE ANNOUNCED IN LONDON.

LONDON, December 6.—Lord Headley, whose recent conversion to the Muslim faith caused a sensation, took part a few days ago in a gathering of Muhammadans at Caxton Hall, for "jooma-nimaz," or prayers. The Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn, leader of the Muslims in England, announced several more converts, including Viscount de Pudre of Antwerp, Capt. Stanley Marquis, and Miss Lilley Ranson. Two other women, he said, had been initiated, one belonging to the middle class and one to the "upper ten," but for the present they wished their names to be secret.

Lord Headley has adopted the Muḥammadan name of "Saifurrahman Sheikh Rahmahillah Farooq."

With Lord Headley as one of the worshippers, some thirty Muhammadans of all nationalities met yesterday at Lindsey Hall, Notting Hill Gate. The service began shortly before noon. The worshippers were Turks, Indians, Persians, and men of other nationalities. Lord Headley arrived shortly before the service began, with the Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn.

Mr. Fisher, a young Englishman who has lived for some time in Northern Africa, and has been a Muḥammadan for ten years, took part in the service. After the floor had been covered with spotless white sheets the men all removed their shoes, and for a time sat cross-legged on the floor.

Then one of the company stood up, and in a loud voice—just as they call from the minarets of the mosques in the East—cried out : "Allah-o-Akbar !" (God is great !)

The worshippers who did not wear the fez covered their heads with pocket handkerchiefs. All touched the ground with their foreheads as they said their devotions. For some minutes the worshippers alternately stood up and bowed their heads to the ground in silent prayer.

The Khwājah Kamāl-ud-Dīn, a tall imposing Indian with a black beard and wearing a large dark turban, then gave an address with a text from the Sermon on the Mount. After the Moulvie, Zāfar Alī Khān, gave an address.

"It is not true what Kipling says, that 'East is east and West is west, and never the twain shall meet,'" he said. "The two are rapidly meeting each other, and Lord Headley has done much to bridge the gulf between them."

Lord Headley then came in front of the worshippers to read the "dua"—the prayer. Some extracts from it are as follows :

"May we, O God, our preserver and comforter, endeavour to follow in the footsteps of thy holy prophets—Moses, Christ, and Muḥammad—and from their teachings may we learn humility and patience. . . . Give us courage to follow in the footsteps of thy prophet, the divinely inspired Muḥammad, whose memory do thou, O God, keep fresh and green in our hearts."

APPENDIX VI

AḤMADĪYAS DECLARED TO BE MUḤAMMADANS

Ruling of the Patna High Court, 21st December, 1916.

Hākīm Khalīl Aḥmad *vs.* Malik Israfi, and Malik Israfi *vs.*
Hākīm Khalīl Aḥmad.

The facts of the case were as follows :—

The plaintiff alleged that they were Muḥammadans and followers of Hazrat Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad; that they used to offer up their prayer with other followers of their own sect in a mosque in Dillawarpur, Monghyr; that they did so up to the 2nd December, 1911, when they were illegally and maliciously interfered with and prevented from entering the mosque by the defendants' 1st party, at the instigation of defendants' 2nd party. The plaintiffs used for declaration that they had a right to offer prayers in the said mosque with the people of their own sect, and that the defendants had no right to prevent them from doing so, and that the defendants be permanently restrained from interfering with right of the plaintiffs to offer prayers in the said mosque, collectively and individually. The Court of first instance held that the plaintiffs were Muḥammadans, and that they were entitled to offer prayers individually behind the Hanīfī Imām of the mosque, but that they were not entitled to form a separate congregation for prayer in the mosque. The suit was dismissed. An appeal to the District Judge was dismissed, but he ordered it to be declared that the plaintiffs are at liberty to worship in the disputed mosque behind the recognised Imām of the mosque, in the same congregation with the defendants and other Sunnis. Both sides appealed to the High Court.

Chamier, C. J.—There are cross appeals against a decree of the District Judge of Monghyr, modifying

a decree of the Subordinate Judge of Monghyr, which dismissed the plaintiffs' suit.

The plaintiffs are professed followers of Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad of Khadian in the Punjab, who acquired considerable notoriety as a preacher about thirty-five years ago, and attracted a considerable following in the Punjab, and elsewhere. The followers of Ghulām Aḥmad are known generally as Aḥmadīs or Khādīānīs. The plaintiffs' case was that, though dissenters from what is generally regarded as the orthodox Muḥammadan faith, they are true Muḥammadans. They say that till December, 1911, they were in the habit of offering up their prayers, both individually and as a congregation, in a certain mosque in Mahalla Dilāwarpūr, in the town of Monghyr, but were prevented by the defendants from doing so. They claimed a declaration of their right to offer prayers in the mosque, both individually and as a congregation, and also an injunction restraining the defendants from interfering with them. The defendants resisted the suit on various grounds, and *inter alia* pleaded that the plaintiffs were not Muḥammadans at all. The Subordinate Judge held that the plaintiffs were Muḥammadans, but were not entitled to form a separate congregation for prayer in the mosque. He held that they were entitled to offer prayers individually behind the Hanifi Imām of the mosque, but as they did not desire to do so he dismissed the suit. On appeal, the District Judge agreed that the plaintiffs must be regarded as Muḥammadans, and that they could not be allowed to form a separate congregation for prayers in the mosque, but gave them a declaration that they were entitled to worship in the mosque behind the recognized Imām, and in the same congregation as the defendants.

In the second appeal the plaintiffs contend that their claim should have been decreed as laid, and the defendants contend that the suit should have been dismissed altogether.

Some attempt was made on behalf of the defendants to controvert the concurrent findings of the Courts below, that the plaintiffs were Muḥammadans, but it was not

seriously pressed. The Courts below have given convincing reasons for holding that the plaintiffs are Muḥammadans, notwithstanding their pronounced dissent from orthodox opinion on several important articles of the faith. The plaintiffs, as Muḥammadans, appear to be entitled to enter the mosque if they please, and to offer up prayers with the regular congregation behind the recognised Imām, but as they profess to regard 'orthodox' Muhammadans as infidels, it is unlikely that they will take advantage of the decree made by the District Judge.

The important question in the case is, whether the plaintiffs are entitled to pray as a separate congregation in the mosque, *i.e.*, behind an Imām of their own. The claim is an extravagant one, and there can be little doubt that if it is allowed there will be serious trouble in the mosque. The plaintiffs contend that every mosque is dedicated to the worship of God, and is open to any Muḥammadan, to whatever sect he may belong, who chooses to pray in it. The cases of *Queen-Empress vs. Rāmzān* (1), *Atāullah vs. Azīm-ullah* (2), and *Jnagu vs. Ahmad-ullah* (3), and other authorities on which the plaintiffs rely, certainly support this contention, but they lend no support to the further contention advanced by the plaintiffs, namely, that the members of any and every sect are entitled to pray in every mosque as a separate congregation behind an Imām chosen by themselves. The mosque in question has been in existence for about 200 years, and appears to have been used all along by orthodox Sunnī Muḥammadans. In all probability it was established for the benefit of Sunnī Muḥammadans, although it may be that other Muḥammadans are entitled to pray in it individually, or join in the congregational worship which is conducted there. No authority whatever has been cited for the proposition that half a dozen members of a new sect (it is said that there are only so many Aḥmadīs in Monghyr) are entitled to thrust themselves into a mosque which has been used by orthodox Sunnī Muḥammadans for generations, form a separate congregation there, and disturb the old standing arrangements for the conduct of

worship in the mosque. It is suggested that certain times might be allotted to the plaintiffs for congregational worship with their own Imām. Such an arrangement appears to be unknown to the Muḥammadan law. It would curtail the time available for the orthodox Sunnis who have used the mosque for so many years. As already stated, the plaintiffs regard orthodox Sunnis as infidels. The orthodox Sunnis, in their turn, regard the Aḥmadīs as infidels, and have, we are told, formally denounced them as such. There would almost inevitably be serious trouble in the mosque. It appears that what the plaintiffs wish to do is like to cause acute friction (if not worse), if they actually disturb the orthodox in their prayers in the mosque. As there is no authority for the contention advanced by the plaintiffs, and it is clear that the rights enjoyed by the orthodox for generations would be seriously impaired by the intrusion of the plaintiffs as a separate congregation, and it is certain that admission of their claims could result in umseemly conflicts in the mosque, I am of opinion that their claim should be rejected.

I would dismiss both appeals with costs.

Roe, J.—I agree that this appeal should be dismissed, the sole object of the case is to secure a decree that the appellants are entitled to deliberately abstain from joining in the ordinary worship of the mosque, and to appoint an Imām of their own to read prayers for them after the ordinary worship has been concluded. The learned Subordinate Judge, who tried the case, is himself a Muḥammadan gentleman, and he quotes it in his judgment as a well known rule of worship, that where people deliberately come late to prayers they will not be allowed to have a second service of their own. This seems to me to be in accordance with an extract from B—7 and B—13 of volume of the chapter relating to Azān of Zadul Maad, which runs : “ Even if he waits for the Imām of his own sect, having removed himself from the midst of the men of different sect, while offering up prayers with the congregation, this act of his will not be considered as his turning away from the congregation with abhorrence when it is known that he is waiting for a congregation which is most

perfect.” This seems to imply that if he does turn away from the regular prayers with abhorrence he cannot be allowed to have a special Imām of his own. In the case before us the plaintiffs state clearly that they will not under any circumstances worship behind an Imām who does not recognize Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad. Having made that statement of fact, it seems to me clear that they are not permitted to have subsequent services and worship under an Imām of their own. I agree, therefore, that the appeals should be dismissed with costs.

APPENDIX VII

AN AḤMADIYA CHALLENGE

The following letter appeared in *Hablul Matin*, a Calcutta Muslim paper, in December, 1915. It is given without corrections exactly as it appeared :—

*Calcutta,
5th December, 1915.*

To

THE EDITOR OF "HABLUL MATIN."

DEAR SIR,

I send herewith for favour of publication a copy of my letter to the address of the Rev. S. G. Eddy American Missionary¹ which was delivered to him yesterday.

It is expected that the reverend gentleman will agree to the public discussion suggested, and that the dates will shortly be fixed which may be convenient to both the parties. The reverend gentleman has given out in his lectures that the regeneration of India through Christianity is his life's mission therefore it is hoped that he will agree to the proposal suggested.

*Brendreth Road,
Ahmadaya Buildings,
Lahore.*

I remain,
Very faithfully yours,
MIRZA YAQUB BEG.

4th December, 1915.

To

THE REV. S. G. EDDY.

American Missionary.

Y.M.C.A., Lahore.

DEAR SIR,

I hear that in your public lectures in Lahore, which I am sorry to say I have not been able to attend, you have put forward the startling claim that Christianity is the only religion which is calculated to

¹ The original copy of this letter was received by G. Sherwood Eddy, Esq., then Secretary for Asia of the International Committee of the Young Men's Christian Association, on the eve of his departure from Lahore after delivering a series of five lectures on the Christian religion, in which attacks on other religions were scrupulously avoided.

elevate mankind. I write those lines on behalf of a great majority of people here who differ from you in this contention.

In view of the great importance of your claim for mankind generally and India especially I venture to suggest that a public discussion may be held on the claims of Christianity as a religion. I hope that in the interests of humanity you will kindly agree to this proposal, and fix a suitable date for this discussion. It is further suggested that the following points should receive special attention in this discussion :—

1. That the Christian doctrine of the elemental wickedness of man with all the consequences flowing from it has proved a source of degradation to mankind, and the civilisation of Europe dates from the final rejection of this doctrine.

2. That Christian Ethics has proved a miserable failure in the life of individuals as well as nations, and that the entire history of mankind is opposed to the principles of Christian morality.

3. That the present state of European thought and life is wholly opposed to both Christian dogma and Christian ethics.

4. That modern European criticism has shattered the Bible into pieces, and assuming that the message of Christ is still preserved intact in this book, it never claimed to be a universal message.

5. That the Quran claims to be a universal book, and that all the healthy institutions of the modern world can be traced directly or indirectly to its influence.

6. That Islam is the only religion which can keep pace with the growth of modern ideas.

7. That the failing off of the Muslim World from the ideals of the prophet is due to the assimilation by Musalman people of non-Moslem views of life.

Yours truly,

MIRZA YAQUB BEG, L.M.S.,

Honorary Secretary the Ahmadia Amjuman

Ishaat-i-Islam, Lahore

INDEX

- A**BDUL Karīm, Maulvī 68
 Abdul Latīf, Maulvī, Afghanistan 70, 74
 Abdul Latīf, Professor, Ceylon 120
 Abdulla Ātham 43, 44, 111
 Abdulla Chakrālvi 40
 Abdulla of Tīmāpūr 46
 Abdur Rahmān, Syed 93
 Ablutions 108
 Abraham 128, 151
 Abrogation, of other religions by Islām 109; of Qur'ānic verses denied 42, 56
 Abū Bakr 122
 Abū Hurairah 30
 Abyssinia, Christian king of 73
 Adam 25, 26, 28, 82, 152
 Ādī Samāj 105
 Adoption of Islām, *see* Initiation
 Advent, second, of Elijah, John in his spirit and power 28, 88; of Jesus, Ahmad in his spirit and power 25-37, 52, 77, 78, 88, 122, 132, 137, 138; of Muḥammad, Ahmad 55, 147
 Afghanistan 19, 70, 74, 75, 90, 91; Amīr of 70, 74
 Africa, North 153
 "Age of the New Testament, The" 130
 Agra 92
 Agreement, Muslim (*ijmā'*) 42, 67, 132
 Ahl-i-Hadīs 17
 Ahl-i-Qur'ān 40
 Ahmad, Mīrzā Ghulām, meaning of name 30; birth 13; early life 14-15; founder of movement 16, 104, 132; literary work 16-18; character 18-23; loyalty to Government 14, 35, 71-74; last days and death 23, 24, 113; claims, Promised Messiah 25-37, Mahdī 37-39; Incarnation of Kṛiṣṇa 50, 51; other titles 51, 116, 131, 132; signs, miracles and prophecies 40-50, 105-108; elements of orthodoxy in teaching 53-58; of Sūfiism 58-64; of heresy 70-74, 90-94; reactionary character of teaching 64-67; criticism of Christianity 24, 75, 81, 94-99; of Islām 35, 68-70; of Hinduism 24, 101-105; of Sikhism 108; of Buddhism 109; conception of Jesus and the Christian Scriptures 77-80, 82-94; relation to Bashīr-ud-Dīn's claims 122; relation to Bahā'ism 53, 138; present attitude of Ahmādīs toward 124, 139, 140; final estimate of 131-133, 138
 Ahmad Khān, Sir Syed 17, 66, 67, 133, 136, 137
 Ahmad, Muḥammad, of Dongola 72.
 Ahmad, Syed, of Oudh 72
 Ahmad, Syed, of Mysore 72
 Ahmādī, *see* Ahmādīya
 Ahmādīya Association, Ceylon 120
 Ahmādīya buildings, Lahore 126, 161
 Ahmādīya community, name 111; origin 16, 24, 111; opposition of orthodox 111; size 112; first *Khalīfa* 113; political controversy and resentment against Bashīr-ud-Dīn 113, 114; second *Khalīfa* 114; split 114-116, 139;

- Qādiān party 116-125; Lahore party 116, 124-130; mission to England 120-130; significance of 136-140; conditions of initiation and articles of belief 123, 128, 145-148, 151-153; duties and management 148-150; Ahmadis declared Muslims 155ff.
- Aḥmadiya periodicals, *see* Periodicals
- Aḥmadiya societies, *see* Society
- Akbar*, *Allah-o*, (God is great) 153
- Aleppo 74
- Alfārūq* 117
- Alfazl* 113, 117
- Al Ghazālī 131
- Alhakam* 117
- Al-Hallāj 38
- 'Alī 17
- Aligarh 45, 66, 133, 134
- Allah, *see* God
- All-India Moslem League 67, 114, 126, 136, 140
- Almsgiving 58, 151, 152
- America, references to, in *Review of Religions* 17
- American Messiah, The, Dowie 32
- American Missionary, an, G. S. Eddy 160
- Amīr 'Alī, Syed 17, 64, 65, 67, 135, 136, 137
- Amīr of Afghanistan 70, 74
- Ananikian, Prof. M. H. 74
- Anās, tradition from 36
- Angel, Aḥmad 37; Gabriel 23, 54
- Angelic, children 129; lives 98
- Angels 61, 67, 144, 151
- Animals' voices 144
- Anjuman-i-Aḥmadiya* of Ceylon 120; *Ṣadr* 57
- Anjuman-Ishā'at-i-Islām* 94, 114, 124, 125, 126, 161
- Anjuman Taraqqī-i-Islām* 117, 121, 149
- Anti-Christ (*Dajjāl*) 31, 38, 96
- Anti-Christian 135, 140
- Antwerp 153
- Apocalyptic hopes, *see* Eschatology
- Apocrypha 84
- Apologetics, Muslim 127, 134, 136
- Apostacy in Aḥmadiya community 150; in Islām 74, 97, *see* *Murtadd*
- Apostles of God 146, 147, 148, 150; of Jesus, *see* Disciples
- Apostolic Church in Zion, Christian 45
- Arabs, Arabia, Arabic 14, 15, 22, 30, 33, 40, 41, 64, 66, 68, 73, 109, 117, 121, 136, 138
- Arkān* (Pillars of Islām) 57, 58, 71.
- Arts 134
- Articles of Faith, Aḥmadiya 147, 148, 151-152, 161
- Ārya Samāj 16, 17, 43, 51, 99, 103, 104, 111, 135, 136
- Āsaf*, ("to gather") 93
- Ascension of Jesus 84, 107, 132, 138, *see* Cross, The
- Ascetics, Muslim 107, 124, *see* Darwish
- Asia 13, 136, 160
- Aspects of Islām*, by Macdonald 21, 135.
- Assam 47
- Assyria 91
- Astrologers 143
- Ath Thalābī, "Stories of the Prophets," by 78
- Avatār*, Aḥmad, of Kṛiṣṇa 50; the Brāhman 51; Nānak, the, of the Hindus, 106, *see* Incarnation
- Awakening of Islām, The*, by Heaford 75
- BĀBAR** 13
- Bābism 134
- Badakhshān 91
- Badr 104, 117
- Al-Baghāwi 30
- Bahā'ism 53, 138

- Bahā'ism and its Claims*, by Wilson 138
 Bahā'Ullah 53, 138
 Bai'āt 16, 111, 145, 146, 149
 Bait-ul-Māl 124, 149
 Balfour, E., *Cyclopædia of India* 105
 Baptist Missionary Society, New Zealand 118
 Baqar'Id, or 'Id-uz-Zuhā 43
Barāhin-i-Aḥmadiya 13, 15, 32
 Barker, Elsa, *Letters from a Living Dead Man* 23
 Barlaam and Josaphat 92
Barzakh (intermediate state) 62
 Bashir-ud-Dīn Mahmūd Aḥmad 15, 52, 109, 114, 116, 122, 123, 137, 145
 Bengal 47, 48, 49, 118, 120, 133
 Bengal, East 118
 Bernier 91
 Bhagalpūr 118
 Bhin 45
 Bible, the authority of 26; Contrasted with Qur'ān 54; Muḥammadan attitude toward 79; Aḥmad's attitude toward 79, 80; quoted by Aḥmadiya writers 83; professor of 125; taught in Aḥmadiya school 125; Syed Aḥmad Khān's attitude toward 134; higher criticism of 80, 161, *see* Old Testament, New Testament
Biblical World, The 18
Bibliatque de Carabas 92
 Bihar 118
Bambay Advocate 119
 Bombay City 138
 Bombay Presidency 112
 Book, the, Christian Scriptures 77, 79; Granth Sahib 106; Qur'ān 147, 148, 152; for every people 109; none after the Qur'ān 123
 Books, the holy, of God 26
 Brahmā 101, 105
 Brāhman Avatār, the, Aḥmad, 51
 Brahmanbaria, E. Bengal 118
 Brāhma Samāj 17, 105, 135
 British, coming to India 31, 108; rule in India 13, 35, 37, 71, 75, 108; liberal Government 48; Muslim Association 127; war with Russia 31
 Brotherhood, with Aḥmad 147; of Islām 73
 "Brotherhood, Universal" 130
 Browne, E. G. 18
Bubonic Plague, A Revealed Cure for the, by Aḥmad 41
 "Buddha of the East," Aḥmad 52
 Buddhism 17, 109
 Bulbul Shāh 93
 Bulgaria 49
 Bull of Pope Gregory XIII 72
 " " " Pius V 72
 Burma 109
Burūz, Aḥmad, of Muḥammad 37; of Kṛiṣṇa 50, *see* Manifestation.
 CALCUTTA 64, 68, 105, 160
 Cambridge, England 127
 Cambridge Local College and Examination 125
 Campbell, Rev. R. J. 18
 Cana, Jesus' miracle at 83, 85
 Canada 34
 Cannanore 119
 Capital punishment 73
 Castes, low, not wanted by Aḥmad 97
 Cawnpore 113
 Caxton Hall, London 127, 153
 Celibacy 66
 Census report, of India 111; of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa 118; of the Punjab 98, 112
 Central Islāmic Society 127
 Century Bible, The 27
 Ceremonialism of Islām 35, 57, 68, 69
 Ceylon 118, 120
Ceylon Independent 120
 Chakrālvi, Abdulla 40
 Chamārā 97

- Chandals 97
 Chicago, U.S.A. 21
 Chief Court of Panjab, decision of 42
 China 118
 Chirāgh 'Alī, Maulvī 135, 136
 Chirāgh Dīn 43
 Chittagong College 120
 Chittu, Shaikh Muḥammad 40
 Chōlā (cloak) of Nānak 106
 Christ, *see* Jesus
 Christ, *Dictionary of, and the Gospels* Hastings 78, 79, 86
 Christ in *Jewish Literature*, by Herford 86
 Christ in *Muhammadan Literature*, by Sell and Margoliouth 78, 79
 Christ, *The Moslem*, by Zwemer 39, 77, 78
 Christ, *Unknown Life of*, by Notovitch 92
 "Christendom and Islām," 130
 Christian Apostolic Church, The 45
 Christian Civilisation 69, 75, 100
 Christian era, history of the 94
 Christian king of Abyssinia 73
 Christian misrepresentation of Islām 126, 129, 130
 Christian rule 73, 75
 Christian scholarship 80
 Christian teacher, a 19, 78
 Christianity, attacks on 127, 129, 136, 137; controversy on the part of 16, 81, 99, 111, 137; conversions from and to, *see* Converts; corruption of 79, 80, 96, 99; departure from Jesus' teaching 89; error regarding Jesus' death 90, 91; Eschatology 25ff; ethics and morality 161; Missions and Missionaries, *see* Missionaries; power of 133, 134; Scriptures of, *see* Bible; a source of Islām 64; women in 99, 127.
 Chronicles, Book of, First, *see* Old Testament
 Chuhṛas 98
 Civil and Military Gazette, Lahore 74
 Claim to Promised Messiahship, My, by Aḥmad 25
 Cleanliness of Muslims 152
 Clergy of Islām, new school of 67; of United States and Canada, crimes of 34, *see* Priesthood, Maulvīs, Missionaries.
 College, at Aligarh 66, 134; of Lahore party 124; Cambridge Local 125; Oriental 126
 Commentaries, Commentators, on Old Testament 27, 134; on Qur'ān 79, 121
 Companions of Muḥammad 148
 Comparative religions 52.
 Comrade, The 136
 Conference of Religions, Lahore 17
 Congress (Indian National), League (All India Moslem) scheme 126
 Constantinople 74
 Contemporary Review, The 18
 Converts, to the Aḥmadiya movement 46, 103, 118, 133, 134, 145; to Bahā'ism 138; to Christianity 97, 125; to Islām 72, 73, 135, 153.
 Cornhill, *History of Israel* 91
 County of London Sessions 128
 Cow, sacred to Hindus 101
 Creation, new 60; of souls 102
 Creative act of Allah, Adam 82; Jesus 77, 82
 Creator, the, God 150, 152
 Creed of Muḥammad 22, 136, *see* Kalima
 Crime, Crimes, of ancestors damning their descendants 129; of clergy and missionaries 34, 100; of Lord Headley 128; of sweepers 98; prayer keeping from 152
 Crimes of Preachers 34
 Criminal tribes, the 126
 Critical attitude of Aḥmad 24
 Critical judgment absent, in Aḥmad 18; in the Aḥmadiya community 139

- Criticism, the higher, of the Bible 18, 80, 161; of the Qur'ān 121
- Cross, the, Jesus' cry on 86; Jesus' suffering on 95; Jesus' alleged escape from 42, 76, 88, 89, 90, 91; to be broken by Jesus 30
- Crucifixion, doctrine of, rejected by Muḥammad 78; Jesus' alleged attempt to escape 85; Jesus' desertion before 97
- Curse, Curses, pronounced by Aḥmad on his enemies 30, 43ff; by Jesus on the fig tree 83
- Custom, of Muḥammad, *see* Sunna; of Islām to-day 135
- Cuttack 118
- Cyclopedia of India*, Balfour 105
- Cyrus, king of Persia 27
- DAJJĀL** (Anti-Christ) 31, 38, 96
- Damascus 20; John of 92
- Daniel, Mr. 19, 20
- Dār-ul-Harb* 71
- Dār-ul-Islām* 71
- Darwishes, banned 124; Qalandar order of 108; Senūsīte order of 72
- Dayānand Sarasvatī, Swāmī 103, 135
- Dead, Christianity 91, 138; Islām 68, 69, 139; Lahore party 125; Muhammad in contrast to Jesus 132, 137; raised by Aḥmad 42; by Jesus 77, 84, 137; seen by Aḥmad 63, 144
- Debates and discussions, public 118, 119, 126, 127, 160, 161
- Debendra Nath Tagore 105
- Deccan, the 46, 118, 119
- Decree, of God 146, 147; of District Judge, Monghyr 156
- Deity, of Buddha 109; of Rāma 102; of Jesus 86, 87, *see* God
- Delhi 47, 133
- Dementia of Aḥmad suggested 19, 20
- Democracy of Islām 97
- De Massignon, *Kitāb ut Tawāsīn* 38
- Dera Bābā Nānak, Panjab 106, 108
- Deputy Commissioner, Lahore 42
- Desai, Rev. N. 46
- De Slane, *Mukaddima* 20, 30, 38
- Deuteronomy, Book of Driver's Commentary on, in International Critical Commentary 27, *see* Old Testament
- Development of Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional Theory*, by D. B. Macdonald 65
- Diabetes of Aḥmad 15
- Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Hastings' 78, 79, 86
- Dictionary of Islām*, Hughes' 71, 74
- Dilāwar Husaīn 66
- Dilāwarpūr, Monghyr 155, 156
- Disciples, of Aḥmad 138; of Jesus 44, 80, 90, 95, 99
- Discoveries, great, of Aḥmad, absence of abrogated verses in Qur'ān 42; Arabic the mother of languages 41; Cure for Bubonic Plague 41, 42; tomb of Jesus in Kashmir 93; Nānak, a Muslim 106
- Diseases, of Aḥmad 15, 20, 24; cured by Aḥmad 144
- Disloyalty, in India 74, *see* unrest; of Lahore party to Aḥmad 116
- Divorce 68
- Doctrine of person of second *Khalīfa* 122
- Douglas, Prof. J. A. 92
- Dowie, J. A. 21, 32 43, 45, 49, 112
- Doyle, Sir A. C. 23
- Dreams, interpretation of 20, 143, *see* Visions
- Driver, Commentary on Deuteronomy 27
- Drunkenness, in Europe 99, 129; in Islām 35, 69; of Jesus

- alleged 85, 86; of Lord Headley 128
 Dulunijal, Panjab 45
Durūd (Prayer invoking a blessing) 146
- EARTHQUAKE**, Sign of the Messiah's advent 28; of 1905 48, 49
 East, the, Jesus' alleged residence in 90, 91, 92
 East, the Far 120
 East and West, God the Master of 151; the prophets of 151
East, The, and the West 18
 East Bengal 118
 Eclecticism, of Bābism and the Ahmadiya movement 134, 136 138; of Bashīr-ud-Dīn 109
 Eclipse of Sun and Moon, sign of the Messiah's advent 30
 Eddy, G.S. 160
 Edinburgh, World's Missionary Conference at 18
 Educated Muslims 116, 118
 Education, Muslims behind in 133, 134; Western 66, 133; of Lahore party 124; of Qādiān party 116, 149; of women at Qādiān 117
 Egypt 18;
 Elias, *see* Elijah
 Elijah, death of 84; second coming 28, 87; Dr. Dowie's claim to be the second 21, 45; John's coming in his spirit and power 28, 88
 Elizabeth, Queen 72
Encyclopedia Biblica, The 18, 80 88
Encyclopedia Britannica, The 18, 91
Encyclopedia of Islām, The Leyden 18
Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, The, Hastings' 103
Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, The New Schaff-Herzog 92
 Enemies, of Ahmad denounced 16, 85; of Jesus defined 34; successful 89; not to be prayed for 150
 England, Muslim Mission to 118, 120, 125ff, 138, 153, 154; references to, in *Review of Religions* 17
 English, Bible 125; High School at Qādiān 117; periodicals of Ahmadiya movement, Qādiān party 117; Lahore party 113, 126; translations of the Qur'ān 121, 126
 "Esau," Jewish name of Jesus 77
 Eschatology, of Jews and Christians 25-30; of Muslims 30-31, 37-39, 49, 132, 137, 138
Essays, Indian and Islāmic, by S. Khudā Bukhsh 64, 66, 68
 Ethics, Christian 161; of Islām 131
 European, civilization 161; conversion to Islām 129; drunkenness, debauchery, etc. 99, 129; scholars 134; style in house 121
 Evangelistic Societies, Christian 96
 Eve 26
 Evil, foresworn 146, 148; in the world 131; overcome by God 150; Spirits 83
 Examination, Cambridge Local 125; Matriculation, of Panjab University 125
 Ezekiel, Book of, *see* Old Testament
- FAITH OF ISLĀM, THE**, by E. Sell 37
Faith of the Crescent, The, by J. Takle 118
 Fakhr-ud-Dīn ar-Rāzi 79
 Famine, sign of the Messiah's advent 28
Faqīr 108
 Far East, The, 120
 Farquhar, J. N. 92, 133, 134
 Fasting 58, 67, 107, 129, 152
See Roza, Saum
 Fath 'Alī Shāh 46
Fath-i-Islām 16
 Father, the, in the Trinity 94

- Fātiha, Sūrat-al 41
Fatwā 16, 69, 70
 Festivals, religious 101, *see* Id.
 Fetishism 101
Finality of the Christian Religion, The, by G. B. Foster 17
 Finances, of Qādiān party 118, 124, 148, 149; of Lahore party 126; of Woking Mission 130
 Fire, worshipped in India 101
 Fire, The, *see* Hell
 Fisher, Mr. 151
 Fitzgerald, Edward 64
 "Five Principle Doctrines" of Ahmad 72
 Forgiveness, of Jesus 88; of God 151, 152
 Form, for reception into Islām in England 128; for reception into the Ahmadiya movement 145
 Formalism of Islām 136, 139
 Forman Christian College, Lahore 46, 126
 Foster, G. B. 17
 "Fraud theory" of Jesus' death 90
 French writer, A 134
 Friday, day of Adam's and Ahmad's births 26; prayers 41, 119, 127, 128, 151
 Fuller, Sir B. 47
 "Fundamental Doctrines of the Muslim Faith, The," by Ahmad 57
 Funeral service of non-Ahmadi's 150
 Future, life 59, 60-63, 123, 152; civilization 135

GABRIEL, the Angel 23, 54
 Gairdner, Rev. W. H. T. 18
 Gambling condemned 35, 65, 99, 129, 152
 Ganges water 101
 Gardens of Paradise 152, *see* Paradise
 Genesis, Book of, Commentary on, by Sir Syed Ahmad Khān 134, *see* Old Testament
 Generation of Jesus, *see* Virgin
 German, Germany 18, 80, 136
 Gethsemane, Garden of 85
 Ghazā (Warring Expedition) 72
 Ghazālī, Al- 131
 Ghulām Ahmad, Mīrzā, *see* Ahmad
 Ghulām Dastagīr, Maulvi 45
 Ghulām Murtabā, Mīrzā 13, 14
Glasgow Weekly Herald 128
 God, attributes 147, 151, 152; personality 103, 151; protecting Ahmad 49; revealing truth 109; source of all religion 105; union with 60; unity of 106, 107, 128; writing on Nānak's *Cholā* 106
 "God and Science" 130
 Gods in the Trinity 94
 Gog (*Yājūj*) and Magog 31
 Goldziher, I. 27, 131, 134
 Gospel, brought by missionaries 97; Jesus' teachings in 88; taken to the ten lost tribes 91, *see* New Testament, *Injīl*
Gospel of Thomas the Israelite 84
 "Gospels," by Schmiedel 80, 83
 Government census reports, *see* Census
 Government of India, action, regarding *Badr* 82, 104, 117; regarding Cawnpore mosque 113, 114; regarding Muhammad 'Alī 136; regarding *Zamīndār* 153
 Government of Panjab, action regarding Ahmad 43, 111
 Government officials 98
 Grades and growth hereafter 63, 123
 Granth Ṣāhib 106, 107
 Greek Physicians 82
 Gregory XIII, Pope 72
 Griswold, H. D. 20, 21, 27, 30, 48, 72, 112
 Guide, the, Ahmad 37, 98, 148; all prophets 151; God 151; Muhammad 121

- Gurdāspūr, Panjab 13, 118, 119
 Guru Nānak, *see* Nānak
 Gurus (spiritual guides), Sikh 106
- HABĪBULLAH**, Amīr of Afghanistan 70, 74
Ḥablul Matin 160
Ḥadīs 56 125, *see* Traditions
 "Haeckel and Islām" 130
Hajj 57, 58, *see* Pilgrimage
Hakam 37
 Ḥākim Khālil Aḥmad 155
 Hallāj Al 38
 Hanifite Imāms 155, 156
 Hard-heartedness, of Jesus 85; of Muslims 69, 70
 Hardinge, Lord 114
 Hartford, Conn., U.S.A. 21, 74
 Hastings, W. 78, 79, 86, 103
 Headley, Lord 128, 129, 153
 Heaford, W. 75
 Heaven, according to Aḥmad 63, 64, 147; God the light of 151; Muḥammad gives access to 122, *see* Paradise.
 Heavens, Jesus in one of the 28, 78, 132
 Hebrew, language 77, 93, 124; appearance of Afghans and Kashmiris 91, *see* Israel
 Hebrews, Book of, *see* New Testament
 Hell 63, 64, 87, 96, 123, 147
 Heresy, of Aḥmad 16, 70ff, 118; of a Christian 78; of Jesus alleged 86, 87; of a Maulvī 119; of the Mu'tazilites 123; punishment of, in Islām 74; by the Jews 87
 Herford, R. Travers 86
Hibbert Journal, The 18
 Higher criticism, *see* Criticism
 Hinduism, Aḥmad's, knowledge of 17; criticism of 24, 51, 101, 104; proposed union with 105, 106
 Hindus, Aḥmad sent to 51, 132; converts from, to the Ahmadiya movement 133; to Christianity 97; in Kashmir 93; Nānak, avatār of 106, 108
 Hindu thoughts 108
 Historicity, of Nānak 108; of the New Testament 79, 80
 History, Professor of Islāmic 125
 Holy Ghost, The 95, 101
 Home, D.D. 23
 Home Rule in India 126
 Hospitals, Mission 99
 Hughes, T. P. 18, 71, 74
 Hurairah, Abū 30
 Hurgonje, C. Snouck 18
 Husain, Imām 41
 Hyderabad 72, 137
 Hymns of Nānak 108
- IBN HAZM** 79
 Ibn Khaldūn 20, 30, 38
 Ibrahim of Aleppo 74
 Iceland 18
 'Id, the, or 'Id-uz-Zuhā, or Baqar-'Id 43
 'Id-ul-Fitr 129
 Ideals, of Christianity, harmful 75; impossible 135; of Islām, low 135
 Idiocy in Islām 20
 Idolatry, Muḥammad's compromise with 56; Nānak's opposition to 106; of Hindus, criticised 101
 "Idolatry, Islām and" 130
Ījāz-ul-Masīh 41
Ijmā' (Agreement) 42, 67
Ikmāl-ud-Dīn 92
 Ilāhī Bakhsh 69
Ilhām 55
 Image, Aḥmad, of God 37; of Kṛiṣṇa 51
 Images, in dreams 60; of Heaven and Hell 63
 Imām, a Hanifite 155, 156; of Mosque, Mauritius 120; of Mosque, Woking 129
 Imāms, Ahmadiya 150; Mahdī, the last of the 38
 Imām Husain 41
 Imām-ud-Dīn, Mīrzā 98
 Imām-uz-Zamān, Aḥmad 37

- "Imperator" 23
Important Discovery Regarding Jesus Christ, An 94
 Imposter, An, Ahmad, if Christianity true 90
 Imposters, other prophets not 109
 Impurity, forbidden by Islām 152
 Incarnation, Ahmad of Kṛṣṇa 50, 51; Jesus, of God 96; Kṛṣṇa, of Viṣṇu 101; Nānak 106; Rāma, of Viṣṇu 102
 Incarnations, Hindu, condemned by Nānak 106
 India, Buddhism dead in 109; Creature, worship of 101; Islām in 127, 133-136, 139; Jesus' alleged visit to 92; Muslim prophets sent to 109; regeneration of, Christianity's mission 160; social system of 106; uneducated in 104, *see* British Rule
India, Cyclopedic of, Balfour 105
India Muslim and the Islāmic Review 113
India, What it can teach us, Müller 102
 Indian, Christian teacher, an 19; converts to Christianity 97; Muslims in London 153; physicians 82; prince, an 92, 93; prophets, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa 109; story, an 92
 Initiation, into the Ahmadiya movement 145; into Islām in England 123, 151
 Infidelity, of Christianity 75; of Islām 69
 Infidels 70, 157, 158
Injil, The 77, 79, 80, *see* New Testament
 Inoculation for plague, Ahmad's objection to 49, 50
 Inspiration, in Islām 137, 147; of the Bible 79, 134; of the Qur'-ān 54, 121, 134; human and divine distinguished 54, 55
 Intercession, in orthodox Islām 36, 152; of Husain 41; of Jesus 36, 87; of the Meccan idols 56; of Muhammad 36, 56, 122, 123, 147; of the prophets 87; of the saints 93, *see* Prayer
 International Bible Students' Association 29
 International Committee, Y.M. C.A. 160
 Intoxicants prohibited 68, 152
 Invalidism, of Ahmad 15, 19, 20; of Bashir-ud-Dīn 116
 Irāk 136
Isā 77, 79, *see* Jesus.
 Isaiah, Book of, in the Century Bible 27, *see* Old Testament
 Ishmael, Children of 27
 Israel, Children of 27, 90, 91; House of 91; Kingdom of 91, *see* Hebrew
Israel, History of the People of, by Cornhill 91
 Israelite, father, lacking to Jesus 82; prophets 84, 110
Israelite, Gospel of Thomas The 84
 Islām (orthodox), Ahmad in relation to 53ff; Ahmadiya movement in relation to 118, 120, 136ff; Lahore party in relation to 124, 140; belief regarding, Jesus' birth 82; Jesus' death 28, 78, 132; Jesus' second coming 25ff; Jesus' character 78, 82, 132; the Christian scriptures 79; the future life 123; intercession 36ff; the intermediate state 62; the Mahdī 37ff, 71ff; the sinlessness of the prophets 81; ceremonialism of 57; converts from 118; converts to 73, 153; differences with the Ahmadiya movement 71ff, 115; with Sir Syed Ahmad Khān 134; essence of 60; glorified by Ahmad 60ff, 129; hostility to Ahmad 19, 34, 51, 111, 118, 119, 120, 155ff; idiocy in 20; in India 127, 133-136, 139; recent periods of development 133ff; rationalistic and universalistic

and unpolitical 133, 134, 136; rationalistic, dogmatic and political 134-136, 137; dogmatic, supernaturalistic and unpolitical 136-140, 144; rationalistic, dogmatic and political 139, 140; misrepresented in the West 126, 129; modifications of 135, 136; the religion of the future 135; its revival by Bashīr-ud-Dīn 122; meaning of, "resignation" 60; scholastic 174; sources of 64; spirit of 135; superiority to Christianity 136; truth of, admitted by Nānak 106; wickedness of 35, 68, 69, 70, see Muhammadan

"Islām" 130

Islām 120

"Islam and Civilization" 130

Islām, Aspects of, by Macdonald 21, 135

Islām, Religious Attitude and Life in, by Macdonald 20, 55, 58

Islām, the Awakening of, by Heaford 75

"Islām in Kashmir," by Walter 93

Islām Mittrian 120

Islām, the Faith of, by Sell 37

Islām the Spirit of, by Amīr 'Alī 64, 65, 66, 135

Islām, the Teachings of, by Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad 16, 54, 55, 57, 58-63, 143

Islām, Vorlesungen über den, by Goldziher 131, 134

"Islām, What is?" 130, 151ff.

Islāmic History, Professor of 125

Islāmic Review and Muslim India, The 113, 127, 128, 129, 130, 151

Islāmpūr 13

Italy 18

JĀGĪRDĀR 98

Jainism 17

Jamā'at 150

Jammu 45

Japan 18, 49 118

Java 118, 120

Jerusalem, destruction of 88, 91;

Jesus in temple at 92

Jesus Christ's, life, birth 82, 83, 104, 127; visit to the temple 92; baptism 85, 92; miracles 33, 77, 83, 84, 138; failure and success 89; persecution 34, 85; betrayal 97; desertion 97; alleged trip to the East 52, 78, 90, 96, 114, 132; death and burial 28, 32, 34, 42, 73, 78, 88, 90-95, 97, 107, 116, 132, 137, 140; resurrection 28, 90, 107, 138; ascension (Christian conception) 84, 107, 138; (Muslim conception) 28, 78, 132; prophecies 33, 44, 49, 78, 87, 88, 90; teachings 29, 87, 88; character besmirched 81, 82, 85, 89, 99, 138; praised 35, 75, 84, 99; doctrine of the person of, Incarnation 96; atonement 95, 96; one Person of the Trinity 94, 95; sinlessness 36, 80, 81, 84; intercession 36, 87; divinity and deity 80, 83, 86, 87, 88, 89; Christian worship of 33, 41; second advent 26, 31, 38, 52, 119, 122, 132, 137, 138; Aḥmad's unique relation to 27, 31-34; a Prophet in Islām ('Isā) 32, 38, 77-79, 84, 87, 119, 128, 151, 154

Jesus Christ, An Important Discovery Regarding 94

"Jesus Christ as Man and God" 130

Jesus of Nazareth, by Krauss 86

Jewish, appearance of Afghans and Kashmiris 91; eschatological hopes 25ff, 28, physicians 42; Rabbinical writings, sources of Islām 64

Jewish Encyclopedia, The 18, 26, 86

Jewish Life of Christ, The 86

Jews, the, abused by Jesus 85; attacks on Jesus 81, 82, 84; attitude towards Jesus 86, 87;

- ceremonialism 68; crucifixion of Jesus 95; denial of Christian Trinity 94; name for Jesus 77; persecution of Jesus 34, 85, 89; religious leaders corrupt 34, 35; women's position among 127; writings plagiarized by Jesus 88
- Jhelum, District, Panjab 45
- Jibra'il* 23, *see* Gabriel
- Jihād* 38, 70-74
- Jizya* 71
- Johannine Sect, 18
- John, Gospel
of, *see* New Testament
- John of Damascus 92
- John, the Baptist 28, 82, 85, 88, 92
- Jonah 90
- Josaphat 92, 93
- Joseph 93
- Joseph (in New Testament) 127
- Judgment, critical, absent in Aḥmad 18, in the Aḥmadiya movement 133, 139
- Judgment Day 25, 28, 30, 32, 37, 71, 122, 123
- "Julia" 23
- Justice of God 96
- K**A'BA 140
- Kabir 106
- Kabira* (greater sins) 123
- Kāfir* 41, 70, 115, 123
- Kalima* 107, 128, 129
- Kamāl-ud-Dīn, Khwājah 17, 24, 74, 99, 113, 118, 125, 126, 127, 129, 139, 153, 154
- Kangra, District, Panjab 49
- Karma* 103, 106
- Kashmir 52, 78, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 116, 132
- Keshab Chandra Sen 105, 135
- Keswick movement 18
- Khaldūn, Ibn, *Mukaddima* 20, 30, 38.
- Khalīfa*, first, of Aḥmadiya movement 111, 113, 149, *see* Nūr-ud-Dīn; second 114, 149, *see* Bashīr-ud-Dīn.
- Khalīfas*, early, of Islām 17, 73
- Khalīfat-ul-Masīh* 113, 149, *see* Nūr-ud-Dīn, Bashīr-ud-Dīn
- Khālṣa High School, Lahore 108
- Khārijites 17
- Khilāfat* 115
- Khinzir* (pig) 41
- Khudā Bukhsh, S. 64, 66, 68
- King-Emperor, the 47
- Kingdom, the, of God 29; of the Son of Man 88, 90; of Israel 91
- Kipling, Rudyard 154
- Kitāb-ut-Tawāsīn*, by Al-Hallāj 38
- Korān, *see* Qur'an
- "Koran, The, according to Aḥmad," by McNeile 121
- Koran, Preliminary Discourse to*, by Sale 25, 30
- Korea 49
- Krauss, Dr. S. 86
- Kṛiṣṇa 50, 51, 102, 110,
- L**AHORE 17, 20, 24, 42, 47, 69, 74, 96, 108, 114, 124, 125, 126, 160
- Lahore party, the 115, 116, 124, 124-126, 140
- Lalitavistāra* 92
- Last Day, *see* Judgment Day
- Law, of God 121; of Islām 19, 68, 131, 135, 145, 147, 148, 151; of Moses 87, 88; of nature 136, 152
- Lectures, *see* Debates and discussions
- Leitner, Professor 126.
- Lekh Rām, Pandit 43, 111
- Leon, Professor H. M. 128
- Letters from a Living Dead Man*, by Elsa Barker 23
- Leyden *Encyclopedia of Islām* 18
- Liberal, Government in Great Britain 48, religion, in U.S.A. 53; of Syed Aḥmad Khān 65, 134
- Liberty of the Press 138; of worship 155
- Lilith 26
- Lindsey Hall, London 153

- Literature, of Aḥmadiya movement, 17; of Qādiān party 117, 118, 120; of Lahore party 125, 126
- Lodge, Sir Oliver 23
- London 64, 118, 120, 127, 153.
- London Muslim Literary Society 127
- London Quarterly Review* 18
- Loyalty, of Aḥmad and his family to Government 13, 14, 35, 71-74; of Muslims in India 73, 74; of the Qādiān party to Aḥmad 116, 139
- Lucknow 67
- Luke, Gospel of, *see* New Testament
- Luxury condemned 35, 68
- Lye T. K. 120
- “M. A. OXON” (Rev. W. S. Moses) 23
- Macauliffe, M.A. 108
- Macdonald, D.B. 20, 21, 42, 55, 58, 65, 135
- Madrasah* at Qādiān 117
- Magdalen, Mary 86
- Magnetizer, Aḥmad 76, 88
- Magog (*Mājūj*) 31
- Mahādevājī 101
- Mahdī, The, Aḥmad 16, 25, 37-39, 71, 111, 119, 135, 147; not a man of blood 38, 71-73
- “Mahdīs bloody” 71
- Mahdiism 138
- Mājūj (Magog) 31
- Malabar 118; North 119
- Malachi, Book of, *see* Old Testament
- Malay 126
- Manifestation, of Aḥmad, Bashīr-ud-Dīn 149; of God, Aḥmad 36, 76; Muḥammad 56; of Muḥammad, Aḥmad 122, *see* *Burūz*
- Mansūkh* (abrogated) 42
- Mantra, C. H. 120
- Maracci 30
- Marāṭhas, the 133
- Margoliouth, D. 18, 78, 79
- Marhām-i-‘Īsā* (“Ointment Jesus”) 41, 90
- Mariam 77. *see* Mary
- Mark, Gospel of, *see* New Testament
- Marquis, Captain Stanley 153
- Martyrdoms of Aḥmad’s followers 19, 70, 74
- Mary, Jesus, son of 29, 30, 380, 86, 94, 122; character aspersed 82, 84, 127; alleged insults to, by Jesus 86; *see* Mariam, Virgin
- Masābih as Sunna* 30
- Masīh, Khalīfat-ul* 113, 115, 1
- Materialism, of Europe 99, 12 of Islām 35, 68, 135
- Matthew, Gospel of, *see* New Testament
- Matter, eternity of 103
- Matriculation examination 117
- Maulvī, Aḥmad called a 98; East Bengal 119; of Lahore 46, 125; a renegade 119
- Maulvīs, corrupt 35, 69, 9 educated 67, 98
- Mauritius 118, 120
- Mecca 58, 73, 106, 107, 108, 13140.
- Media 91
- Mediator between God and man Aḥmad 37, 76
- Medina 93, 132, 139
- Medina Śūras of Qur’ān 68
- Mediums, Spiritualistic 23
- Mercy of God 96.
- Mesopotamia 91
- Message of Peace, The*, by Aḥmad 24, 104, 105
- Messenger of God, Aḥmad 149; 150; Muḥammad 145, 149
- Messengers of God 149, *see* *Rasūl*
- Messiah, the Promised, Aḥmad 16, 20, 21, 25-37, 39-51, 111, 124, 132, 145, 147, 14 of America, J. A. Dowie 32, 4 of Moses, Jesus 33; of Muḥammad, Aḥmad 33; was not Jesus 87

- "Messiah of Qadian, The," by H. D. Griswold 20
- Messiahship of Aḥmad, proved by Jewish prophecies 25-27; Christian prophecies 27-29; Muslim prophecies 29-31; revelation identifying Aḥmad with Jesus 28, 29, 122; similarity in situation of Aḥmad and Jesus, 34-37; Aḥmad's manifestation of and superiority to Muḥammad 36, 37; Aḥmad's fulfilment of prophecies regarding the Mahdī 37-39; outward signs 39-50; identity of Aḥmad and Kṛiṣṇa 50-51; Aḥmad's "great discoveries," *see* Discoveries
- Messiahship, My Claim to Promised*, by Aḥmad 25
- Millennial Dawn* books, by "Pastor" Russell 28, 29
- Millennium of Muslims 25, 26, 28
- Miracles and signs, of Aḥmad 39-50, 93, 143; of Islām 40, 67; of Jesus 33, 77, 83, 84, 138; of Muḥammad 39, 40, 56, 84; of Nānak's *cholā* 106, 107; of the prophets 122, 148; of the saints 69
- Miraculous, the, denied by Buddha, 109; denied by Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān 67
- Mi'rāj-ud-Dīn 13, 15
- Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad, *see* Aḥmad
- "Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad, A False Messiah of India," by R. Sirāj-ud-Dīn 47
- Mirzā Ghulām Aḥmad, the Meh-dī Messiah of Qādiān*, by H. D. Griswold 21, 27, 48, 72
- Mirzās 111, *see* Aḥmadiya
- Miṣhkāt-ul-Masābīh 71, 81
- Misrepresentations of Islām in the West 126, 129, 130
- Missionaries, Christian 13, 14, 17, 18, 31, 33, 34, 44, 54, 85, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 130, 137, 160; Aḥmadiya, 118, 126
- Missionaries, misrepresentations of 130
- Missionary work, Ārya Samāj 103; Aḥmadiya community at Qādiān 117-120, 148; Aḥmadiya party in Lahore 116, 124, 125, 126; Christian, changed spirit of 99; success of 97; of Lahore party in England 118, 125, 126-130, 138, 153, 154
- Missionary Conference, World's 18
- Missionary Review of the World*, The 47
- Modern Movements among Moslems*, by S. D. Wilson 138
- Modern Religious Movements in India*, by J. N. Farquhar 92, 133
- Modernism in the Roman Catholic Church 18
- Modifications necessary in Islām 135, 136
- Mohammedanism*, by C. Snouck Hurgronje 38
- Monasteries, Muslim 68.
- Monghyr 118, 155, 156, 157
- Monogamy, in Christianity 99; in Islām 66
- Monotheism, of Muslims 101; of Vedas denied 102
- Montagu, E. S. 126
- Moplahs 119
- Moral responsibility 152
- Morality, of the Aḥmadiya movement and Bahā'ism, a failure 138; of Christianity, a failure 89, 161; of Islām, practical 135; severe 135; low 135
- Mormonism 17
- Moses 27, 33 87, 88, 128, 151, 154.
- "Moses, Rod of" 69
- Moses, Rev. Stainton 23.
- Moslem, *see* Muslim
- Moslem Christ, The*, Zwemer 39, 77, 78
- Moslem League, the, All-India 67, 114, 126, 136, 140
- Moslem World, The* 18, 42, 55, 93, 112, 121

Mosques 68, 111, 113, 115, 117, 119, 120, 128, 129, 153, 155, 157
 Muftis 70
 Mughal race 13
 Muḥammad, Aḥmad's, spiritual relation to 36, 37, 50, 121, 122; superiority to 37, 132; belief of, regarding, the Bible 79; Jesus' death 78; Jesus' personality 78; *Jihād* 71, Christian attacks on 81; desertion of, by later orthodox Islām 68, 75; life and character of, Ishmaelite stock 27; miracles and signs 39, 40, 56, 84; prophecies 29-31, 49; success 89; buried in Medina 93, 132, 139; sense of sin 131; sinlessness 56, 122; warlikeness 89, *see Jihād*; offices of medium of revelation 65-67, 121, 142; prophethip (Last and Seal) 55, 56, 93, 97, 109, 131, 145, 147, 148, 150; saviour 56; titles of, Messenger of God 128, 145, 151; model for human guidance 122; the Moses of Islām 27; Servant of God 122, 128, 145, 151
 Muḥammad 'Alī, editor of *Comrade* 136
 Muḥammad 'Alī Maulvī 17, 114, 125, 126
 Muḥammad Dīn, Maulvī 117
 Muḥammad Ḥasan, Maulvī 45
 Muḥammad Ḥusain, Maulvī 16, 43, 46, 111
 Muḥammad Ibn-i-Bāḥwaih 92
 Muḥammad Ināyat 'Alī 39
 Muḥammad Ismā'īl, Maulvī 45
 Muḥammad Sādiq, Muftī 117
 Muḥammadan—apologetics 127;
 Muḥammadan commentators and theologians 58, 79; community in India, *see* India, Islām.
 Muḥammadan Anglo-Oriental College, Aligarh 67
 Muḥammadan Educational Conference 66, 67
 Muḥammadan Tract and Book Depot, Lahore 39

Mujaddid ("Reviver") Aḥmad 116, 131
Mukaddima of Ibn Khaldūn 20, 30, 38
 Mulham 55
 Mullahs 16, 30, 35, *see* Maulvīs
 Müller, Max 102
Multaqa-ul-Abḥār 74
 Munshī Fāzil examination 125
Murtadd 74
 Musaliar 120
Mushrik 41
Muslim Faith, The Fundamental Doctrines of the, by Aḥmad 57, 60
 Muslim High School, Lahore 125
Muslim India and Islāmic Review, The 99, 113, 126, *see Islāmic Review*
 Muslims, Aḥmadīs declared to be 155ff, *see* Islām, Muḥammadan
 Mu'tazilites 65; 123, 134
 Mutiny of 1857, the 13
 Mysore 72
 Mythology, Hindu 102

NABĪ, Jesus 77, 119; Prophecy Aḥmad 115, *see* Jesus Christ
 Nadwat-ul-'Ulamā 67, 68
 Nānak, Gurū 106, 107, 108
 Nature, denial of the Trinity in 94; law of 135, 152; worship of in Islām 101
 Neo-Musalmāns 120
 "Neurotic theory" of Jesus miracles 83
 New Dispensation Samāj 105
New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge 92
 New Testament, echoes of, in Aḥmad's teaching 60; historicity of 79, 80; Jesus in 78, 79 prophecies of, fulfilled in Aḥmad 27, 29; quotations from [New Testament, quotation from] Matthew (4: 4) 58; (12: 31) 80; (12: 39) 83; (12: 40

90; (12: 48) 86; (15: 24) 91; (16: 28) 88, 90; (17: 12) 28; (20: 1-16) 27; (24: 34) 87; (27: 42) 89; (27: 46) 80, 86; Mark (3: 21) 80; (10: 17) 80; (10: 18) 87; (13: 32) 80; (15: 34) 80; Luke (1: 17) 88; (2: 17) 28; (7: 37, 38) 86; (22: 36) 89; (23: 43) 87; John (4: 21) 27; (10: 8) 88; (10: 16) 92; (14: 12) 87; (14: 26) 30; (16: 7) 27, 30; 1 Corinthians (2: 9) 61; Hebrews (5: 7) 85; (7: 25) 36, 87; 1 John (4: 1-3) 27; Revelation (20: 1-10) 26; (2: 8) 31

"New Testament, The Age of the" 130

New Theology, The 18

New York Times, the 153

New Zealand Baptist Missionary Society 118

Nimāz 57, 153, *see* Friday prayers
Nineteenth Century, The 92

Niyoga 103, 104

Nizām of Hyderabad, The 137

Noldeke, E. 18

Non-Ahmadi Muslims, relation of, to Ahmadi 115, 116, 117, 150

Non-resistance, Jesus' teaching regarding 88, 89

North Africa 153

North Malabar 119

Notovitch, Nicolas 92

Nūr 117

Nūr-ud-Dīn, Hakīm 40, 82, 111, 113, 114, 115, 122, 139, 149

OBSCURANTISM of Christianity 75

"Ointment of Jesus" 41, 90

Old Testament, History of 91; prophecy fulfilled in Ahmad 26, 27; prophets of 83, 84, 88, 151; quotations from [Old Testament, quotations from] Genesis (2: 8) 26; Deuteronomy (18: 18) 27; (33: 2) 27; 1 Chronicles (5: 26) 91; Isaiah (21: 6)

27; (41: 2) 27; Ezekiel (39: 16) 31; Malachi (4: 5) 28

Omar, *Khalīfa* 122

Omar Khayyām 64

Orders, religious, *see* Darwish

Original Sources of the Qur'ān, The, by Tisdall 64

Orissa 118

Orthodoxy of Ahmad 53ff, *see* Islām (Orthodox)

Oudh 72

Outcastes 97

PAIGHĀM-I-SULAH 125

Palestine 18, 93

Palmer, E. H. 121

Pandits, Hindu 106

Panipat 120

Panjab, the 13, 40, 42, 49, 72, 106, 108, 112, 118, 119, 126, 156

Panjab Census Report 98

Panjab Chief Court 42

Panjab, Government of the 43, 111, 153

Panjab University 117, 125

Paraclete, the 30

Paradise, at the mother's feet 152; hereafter 60, 61-63, 87, 123, 151; on earth 59, *see* Heaven

Parallelism, between the Ahmadiya movement and Bahā'ism 53, 138; claimed by Ahmad between Jewish, Christian and Muslim Messianic prophecies 25-27

Pardah, 67, *see* Veil, the

Pardon, *see* Forgiveness

Pariahs 97, 134

Parkinson, J. 128

Parsis, the 42, 51, 133

Path of God, the 59

Patna High Court 155

Paul, St. 99

Peer, Lord Headley 153

Perfection, hereafter 60, 61-63; in faith and works 123; of Ahmad 36, 143; of Christian Trinity 95; of Islām 54, 64; 65, 66, 75; of Jesus 36, 84, of Muḥammad 36, 121, 122

- Periklutos* 30
 Periodicals, Ahmadiya 17; of Islām 136, 153, 160; of Lahore party 127, 128, 130; of Qādiān party 117, 120
 Persecution, of Ahmad 19, 34, 85; of Ahmadīs 70, 74, 118, 119; of Jesus 34, 35, 89; of Nānak 106
 Persons of the Trinity, the 95
 Persia, Persian, Persians 49, 53, 72, 90, 92, 109, 125, 134, 138, 153
 Peshawar, N.-W. F. P. 72, 126
 Pfander 18
 Pharisees, the 34, 39, 85
 Philippines, the 118
 Philosophy of Muhammad 22
 Physicians, Greek 82; Indian 14, 82; Jewish, Christian, Parsī and Muslim 42
 Pigeon, the Holy Spirit 95, 101
 Pilate 35
 Pilgrimage, of Ahmad to Dera Bābā Nānak 106; to Mecca 58, 68, 106, 107, 108, 120, 132, 140; to Medina 132, 139; to Qādiān 119, 120, 124, 139, 149
 Pillars of Islām, the five (*Arkān*) 57, 58, 71
 Pius V, Pope 72
 Plagiarism of Jesus alleged 88
 Plague, sign of the Messiah's advent 28, 31, 48. Ahmad's alleged protection from 49, 50
Plague, A Revealed Cure for the Bubonic, by Ahmad 41
 Police arrests 120
 Police Inspector of Bengal, a 121
 Police Court, Tower Bridge, London 128
 Political controversy 113, 114, 125, 136, 139
 Poll tax (*jizya*) 71
 Polygamy, justified 67, 99; of Ahmad 138; of Bahā'Ullah 138; of Bashīr-ud-Dīn 116; of Joseph 127,
 Polytheism of Hindus 101
 Polyuria, Ahmad's disease 15, 20
 Pope Gregory XIII 72
 Pope Pius V, 72
 Post-Resurrection appearances of Jesus 90
 Powers of darkness, the 25
 Practice of the Prophet 148, *see Sunna*
 Pragmatism 139
 Prayer, Prayers, call to 108; efficacy denied by Sir Syed Ahmad Khān 67; by Buddha 109; nature of 57, 59; of Ahmadīs 115, 150, 155ff; of Bashīr-ud-Dīn 149; of Jesus 85; prescribed Muslim 41, 57, 107, 115, 119, 127, 128, 146, 149, 152, 153; *see* Intercession
 Prayer Carpet 108
 Prayer duels of Ahmad 32, 44
Preliminary Discourse to the Koran, A, by Sale 25, 30
 Presbyterian Church in India. the 46
 Presidency College, Calcutta 64
 Priesthood, Priests 85, 96, 139, 153, *see* Maulvīs, Mullahs, Missionaries
 Progress after death 63, 123
 Prohibition, of certain foods 107; of intoxicants 68, 152; of mysticism and asceticism 124; of tobacco smoking 68; relating to non-Ahmadīs 115, 118, 120, 150
 Promised Messiah, the, *see* Messiah
 Prophecy, Prophecies, denied by Sir Syed Ahmad Khān 67; in visions 143; uttered by Ahmad 42-50, 108, 122; by Jesus 33, 44, 49, 78, 87, 88, 90; by Muhammad 49; regarding Ahmad 16, 25-31; regarding Bashīr-ud-Dīn 122
 Prophet, a false, Jesus 49, 87, 88
 Prophets, inspiration of 55; miracles of 122; of all peoples 109, 115, 122, 128, 147, 152, 155 of India, Rāma and Kṛiṣṇa

110; of Old Testament 83, 84, 88, 128
 Prophethood, of Aḥmad 55, 122, 123, 131, 147; of Jesus 77, 78, 128, 132; of Muḥammad 55, 56, 93, 97, 109, 131, 145, 147, 148, 150
 Prosecution, of Aḥmad 16, 43; of the editor of *Badr* 104, 117; of the editor of the *Zamīndār* 153
 Prostitution 99
 Protestant Islām 120, *see* Wāḥhābites
 Psychic elements in Aḥmad's revelations 22, 23, 142-144; in Muḥammad's 21, 22
 Psychics, modern 23
 Psychology, modern 21
 Pudre, Viscount de 133
 Puja holidays 119
 Purānas, Purānic 83, 101, 105
 Purgatory, Muslim 123

QĀDIĀN, antecedents of 13; Aḥmad's birth-place 14; burial place 24, 124, 139; headquarters of Aḥmadiyya movement 17, 24; alleged special protection from plague 49, 50; place of Messiah's advent 52; library at 92; Ārya Samāj at 103; visits to, of Mr. Daniel 19; of Dr. Griswold 27; of Prof. Sirāj-ud-Dīn 46; of the author 116, 139; of Aḥmad's followers 119, 120, 124, 139, 149; of Aḥmad's opponents 40, 46; headquarters of later Qādiān party 114, 115, 117, 120, 124, 133, 138, 140, 149

Qādiānī 111, *see* Aḥmadiyya
 Qalandar order of Darwishes 108
 Qasida Ijāzia, by Aḥmad 41
 Qasūr, Lahore District 45
 Qāzīs, in Afghanistan 70
 Qisas-ul-Anbiyā 78
 Quartemère Ed., by De Slane, of *Mukaddima* of Ibn Khaldūn 20, 30, 38
 Queen-Empress, the 157

Qur'ān, the attitude toward, of Aḥmad and the Aḥmadiyya movement 14, 17, 54, 117, 138, 147; of Bahā'ism 138; of Christians 82; of Islām to-day 34; of Sir Syed Aḥmad Khān 130; of the Woking Mission 152; character of, a guidance for Islām 56, 146; inspired 54, 134, 152; a miracle 40; perfect 147; verses abrogated 56, 67; teaching of, regarding Aḥmad 29, 147; Books and prophets 109, 150; the divine decrees 147; the *Injil* 79; intercession 36; Jesus 29, 32, 33, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 132; *Jihād* 71, 72; the last day 30, 31; the life to come 60, 63, 147; monotheism 101; Muḥammad 39; sinlessness of Prophets 81; stages of progress 59; the Trinity 94; verses cited or translations of, into English 120, 121, 125

[Qur'ān verses cited or quoted]
 (II, 81) 81; (III, 214, 215) 71; (III, 40, 42) 77; (III, 43, 47) 78; (III 48) 32; (III, 52) 26, 82; (III, 43) 84; (IV, 76, 79) 71; (IV, 84) 40; (IV, 156) 78; (IV, 169) 77; (V, 116) 94; (VI, 109) 39; (VIII, 39, 42) 71; (IX, 5, 6) 71; (X, 38, 39) 40; (XII, 53) 58; (XIII, 20-24) 152; (XIV, 42) 81; (XVIII, 93, 97) 31; (XIX 11ff.) 82; (XIX 22-34) 82; (XIX, 92) 29; (XXI, 89) 82; (XXI, 96) 31; (XXIII, 52) 82; (XXIII, 102) 62; (XXIV 32) 67; (XXXII, 17) 61; (XXXIX, 54) 152; (XLI 57) 81; (XLIII, 61) 29; (LIII, 20) 56; (LXI, 5) 109; (LXI, 6) 29; (LXIV, 46) 109; (LXVI, 8) 63; (LXVI, 12) 32; (LXXV, 2) 58; (LXXXIX 27) 58; (LXXXIX, 28, 30) 59; (XC VII, 40) 36

Quraish, The 39

RABBINICAL writings of the Jews 26
 Railways in India, sign of Messiah's advent 31
Ra'is 98
 Rāma 102, 110
 Rāmāyana, the 102
 Ramaḍān, fast of 129, *see* Fasting
 Rām Mohan Roy 105, 135
 Ranjīt Singh 13
 Ranson, Miss Lilley 153
Rasūl, Jesus 77, the Qur'ān 40; *see* Messenger
 Rationalism, of Islām 65, 137, 139, 151, 153; of Sir Syed Ahmad Khān 67, 134; of the West 75
 Rāvana 102
Raymond, by Lodge 23
 Reason in religion, advocated 54, 128, 134; deprecated 136, 139
 Recompense hereafter 61, 152, *see* Heaven, Paradise
 Redemption, none in Islām 152, *see* Salvation
 Reformer, Ahmad 51, 131, 137, 147; Bashir-ud-Dīn 122; Jesus 85, 88
 Reform, zeal for 134, 136
 Reforming movement, the Brāhma Samāj 105; Syed Ahmad Khān's party 134
 Reforms forced on Islām 143
 Regeneration, of India 161; through Islām 60, 64; *see* Salvation
 "Relative position of Man and Woman in Islām, The" 130
Religious Attitude and Life in Islām, The, by Macdonald 20, 55, 58
 Remembrance of God 152
 Repentance 153
 Resignation to God (*Islām*) 60
 Responsibility, Moral 152
 Resurrection, Day of 25, 32, 63, 147, *see* Judgment Day; general 28, 147; of an Ahmadiya martyr predicted 70; of Jesus 28, 107, 138

Resurrection, appearances of Jesus, post 90
 Retaliation 88
Revealed Curc for the Bubonic Plague, A, by Ahmad, 41
 Revelation, Revelations, in the Qur'ān 109; in the Bible 83; to Ahmad 19, 20, 22, 23, 67, 70, 71, 93, 106, 121, 132, 133, 137, 138, 139, 142-144; to Jesus 79; to Muhammad 22, 70, 136, 137, 143; of other Prophets 109; denial of 67, *see* Inspiration, Rationalism
 Revelation, New mediums of 23, 138, 139
 Revelation, Book of, *see* New Testament
 "Revelation in Islām, The Doctrine of," by Macdonald 55
Review of Religions in English 17, 114, 117, 118, 125, 149
 [Review of Religions] passages cited or quoted:—Vol. I, (I, 3, 4), p. 99; (I, 15), 26; (I, 16), 36; (I, 17), 34; (I, 20, 21), 73; (I, 23), 70; (I, 62), 69; (I, 65), 94; (I, 72), 82; (I, 80), 41; (I, 99), 41; (I, 110), 87; (I, 112), 89; (I, 114), 85; (I, 120), 86; (I, 141), 86; (I, 144), 82, 83, (I, 152), 87; (I, 159), 89, 99; (I, 196), 84; (I, 205), 42; (I, 206), 27, 33; (I, 207), 84; (I, 239), 88; (I, 251), 33, 37; (I, 266), 30; (I, 277), 54; (I, 280), 95; (I, 311), 65, 66; (I, 315), 43; (I, 318), 35, 68; (I, 321), 67; (I, 322), 68; (I, 329), 67; (I, 333), 37; (I, 340), 33, 70, 96; (I, 347), 101; (I, 348), 87; (I, 349), 34; (I, 368), 40; (I, 371), 85; (I, 393), 37; (I, 409, 410), 102; (I, 417), 50; (I, 418), 50; (I, 451), 88; (I, 452), 86; (I, 453), 83; (I, 454), 84; (I, 456), 40; (I, 457), 95; (I, 463), 86; (I, 495), 41. Vol. II, (II, 32, 33), 107; (II, 35, 36), 107; (II, 55),

- 85; (II, 67), 36, 84; (II, 83), 98; (II, 100), 82; (II, 135), 95; (II, 136), 96; (II, 139), 104; (II, 140), 102, 104; (II, 148), 44; (II, 167), 88; (II, 192), 28, 88, 89; (II, 194), 80; (II, 270), 85; (II, 366), 29; (II, 369), 29, 31; (II, 405), 19; (II, 421), 32; (II, 446), 70. Vol. III, (III, 29), p. 53; (III, 46), 40; (III, 327, 328), 96; (III, 331), 30; (III, 340), 32; (III, 341), 32; (III, 350), 44; (III, 378), 98; (III, 397), 26; (III, 399), 68; (III, 411), 51; (III, 416), 87; (III, 441), 69; (III, 449, 450) 56. Vol. IV, (IV, 145), p. 66; (IV, 174), 67; (IV, 230), 49; (IV, 272, 273), 65; (IV, 317), 54; (IV, 318), 54; (IV, 355), 86; (IV, 434, 435), 97. Vol. V, (V, 82), p. 47; (V, 150 ff.), 19; (V, 215), 34; (V, 365), 48; (V, 390), 89; (V, 438), 99; (V, 459), 45; (V, 461), 44; (V, 477), 88. Vol. VI, (VI, 25), p. 57; (VI, 28), 57; (VI, 30), 58; (VI, 31, 32), 58; (VI, 230), 74; (VI, 251), 49; (VI, 424), 75. Vol. VII, (VII, 43), 76; (VII, 121), 104; (VII, 124, 125), 104; (VII, 222), 13; (VII, 241), p. 24; (VII, 248), 106; (VII, 256), 104; (VII, 257), 105; (VII, 264, 265), 65; (VII, 272), 102; (VII, 406, 407), 97; (VII, 477), 103. Vol. XIV, (XIV, 196), p. 123, (XIV, 217), 116; (XIV, 449), 57; (XIV, 453), 69. Vol. XV, (XV, 9), p. 137; (XV, 26), 13; (XV, 41), 140; (XV, 47), 112; (XV, 84), 110; (XV, 121), 49; (XV, 168), 48; (XV, 204), 102; (XV, 224), 120; (XV, 440), 95, 96; (XV, 457), 112; (XV, 475), 123.
- Review of Religions in Urdu 117
Review of Reviews 18, 23
- "Revival Association, Muslim" 67
Revival in Wales, the 18
Revival of Islām under Bashīr-ud-Dīn 122
Reviver, Aḥmad 116, 131, *see* *Mujaddid*
Richmond, England 126
Rishis, Hindu 51, 105
"Rod of Moses" 69
Roman Catholic Church 18, 72
Roman rule over Jews 35
Rose Hill Mosque 120
Roza 57, *see* Fasting
Rubā'iyāt of Omar Khayyām 64
Russell, "Pastor" 28, 29
Russia 18, 31, 49
- SABAEANISM** 64
Sacrament of the Lord's Supper 85
Sadhāran Samāj 105
Sādiq 117
Ṣadr Anjuman-i-Aḥmadiya 57, 113, 114, 117, 118, 149
Ṣadr-ud-Dīn, Maulvī 117, 125, 126, 123
Saghīra 123, *see* Sin
Sāhibzāda 122, *see* Bashīr-ud-Dīn
Saint, Yūs Aṣaf 93
Saints 28, 29, 88, 107
Saint's tombs 93
Saint worship condemned 35, 69, 124
Salāt, 57, *see* Prayer
Sale, G. 25, 30, 121
Salvation, according to Aḥmad, 17, 57, 76; according to Bashīr-ud-Dīn 123; according to Muḥammad 152; Christian doctrine of, criticized 30; Hindu doctrine of, criticized 101, *see* Regeneration
Sanctification 101
Sargon, King of Assyria 91
Satan 26, 97
Saum 58, *see* Fasting
Saviour, Aḥmad 37; Muḥammad 56

- Saviourhood absent from Islām 152
 Schmiedel, P. W. 80
 School, Schools, Christian Mission 98; Khālṣa High 108; of Lahore party 125; of Qādiān party 117, 149.
 Science, religion and, in Christianity 75; in Hinduism 102, 103; in Islām 41, 152; in Syed Ahmad Khān's party 134
 "Science, God and" 130
 Scotland, Church of 14
 Scribes and Pharisees 34, 39, 85
 Scriptures, Christian 26, *see* Bible; Hindu 104, *see* Vedas; Jewish 88, *see* Old Testament; Talmud Muslim, *see* Qur'ān; of all religions 26, 106; Sikh, the Granth Ṣāhib 106, 107, *see* book
 "Seal of the Prophets," Muḥammad 115, 122, 145, 147, 148, 150
 Seceders, *see* Lahore Party
 Secretary of State for India 126
 Sectarianism in Islām, sign of the Messiah's advent 30; sign of degeneration 35, 38
 Sell, Canon E. 18, 36, 78, 79
 Senūsite Order of Darwishes 72
 Sermon on the Mount, the 154
 Servant and master relationship 147, 151
 Servant of God, Muḥammad 122 128, 145, 151
 Shahādat 57
 Sharik, Shirk 41, 65, 146
 Shari'at 57, *see* Law
 Shearwood, Rev. F. F. 125
 Sheep, lost, of the House of Israel 91, 92
 Sher 'Alī Maulvi 38, 96
 Shi'ites 17, 41, 66, 134, 138
 Shirk 41, 65
 Shorapur 46
 Sialkot 14, 50, 126
 Signs, of Messiah's advent 28, 31, 107, 138, 143, 148; of Mahdī's advent 37-39; shown by Ahmad 39-50; sought from Jesus 83; Supernatural, denied by Sir Syed Ahmad 67, *see* Miracles
 Sikhs, Sikhism 13, 17, 106-109
 Sikh Religion, *The*, by Macauliffe 108
 Sin, Sins, atonement for 96; forgiveness of 152, *see* Forgiveness; greater and lesser 123; of Jesus alleged 84-90; leprosy of 83; Original 129, 152; salvation from, *see* Salvation; woman, the cause of 129, 152
 Sinful man 135
 Singapore 126
 Sinlessness of Jesus 36, 80, 81, 84; of Muḥammad 81, 121; of the Prophets 81; *see* Perfection.
 Sirāj-ud-Dīn, R. 46, 82
 Sita 102
 Siva 101
 Slave India 120
 Smith, G. A. 27
 Society, for Spread of Islām 114; for Advancement of Islām 117; of London Muslims 127; Central Islāmic 127; Chief Ahmadiya 57, 113, *see* Anjuman
 Son of God, Ahmad 34, 37; Jesus 96
 South Africa 18
 Spirit, disembodied 90; the Holy 95; from Allah, Jesus 77; of Christ, Ahmad 122; of God 59, 82
 Spirit and Power, of Elijah, John the Baptist 28, 88; of Jesus, Ahmad 28, 88
 Spirit of Islām, *The*, by Syed Amīr 'Alī 64, 65, 66, 135
 Spirits, Evil 83
 Spirit Teachings, by "M.A., Oxon" 23
 Spiritual-interpretation of Qur'ān, Ahmad's 58 ff, 133; atmosphere at Qādiān 139; sense, the 135, 142, 143
 Split, in Ahmadiya movement

- 113 ff, 139 ; in Brāhma Samāj 105
 Srinagar, Kashmir 78, 90, 93, 107, 132
 Stoning of Aḥmadiya Martyr 70, 74
 "Stories of the Prophets," by Ath Ṭhalābī 78
Studies in the Scriptures, by Pastor Russell 29
 Strauss, D. S. 90
 Sū'ar (pig) 41, *see* Swine
 Successors appointed by Aḥmad 149, *see* *Khalifa*
 Ṣūfiism, Ṣūfis 17, 37, 58, 71, 107, 124, 138
 Suicide absent from Islām 152
 Sun of Righteousness, Aḥmad 37
 Sun worship in India, Muslim attitude towards 152
Sunna 56, *see* Traditions
 Sunnites 17, 25, 41, 46, 134, 138, 155, 158
 Supernatural, The, *see* Revelation, Signs
 Superstition, in Islām 68, 69 ; in the Aḥmadiya movement 124
 Surrey, England 126, 128
 Sweeper class 97, 98
 Swine 30, 31, 41, 83, 152
 Syed Muḥammad 75
 Syncope 20
 "Swoon Theory" of Jesus' death 90
- TAFSĪR-UL-QUR'ĀN** 117
 Tagore, Debendranath 105
Tahrīm Ṣūrat-ut 32
Tahajjud prayers 146
Tahzīb-ul-Akhlāq 134
 Tajik people 91
 Takle, Rev., John 118
 Talmud, the 88
 Tamil language 120
Tanzih-i-Marām 16
Taqdīr 147, *see* Decree
 Tāra Singh, Sardār 108
Tashhiz-ul-Azhān 117
Teachings of Islām, The, by Ahmad, 16, 41, 54, 55, 57, 58-63
 Temple at Jerusalem, The 92
 Theistic movement, the Brāhma Samāj 105
 Thieves, Prophets called 88
 Theologians, Muslim 79
 Theosophy 17
Thomas, the Israelite, Gospel of 84
 Thompson, E. W. 53
 "Thoughts on the Present Situation," by S. Khudā Bukhsh 68
 Thrace 49
 Tibet 92
 Timapūr 46, 119
Times, The New York 153
 Tisdall, Rev., W. St. Clair 64
 Tithe of Aḥmadīs, 124, 148
 Titus, The Roman Emperor 91
 Tobacco-smoking prohibited 68
 Tomb of Jesus in Kashmir, alleged, *see* Kashmir; of Aḥmad in Qādiān 24, 121, 124; of Yūs Āsaf in Srinagar 93
 Tombs of saints 93
 Tower Bridge, Police Court, London 128
 Traditions, Muslim 20, 30, 35, 36, 38, 58, 68, 71, 78, 119, 129, 133, 143, 145, 148, *see* *Sunna*; Christian 78; Hindu 101; Sikh 106, 107
 Trances of Aḥmad 22, 144; of Muḥammad 21
 Translations of Qur'ān into English 121, 126
 Transmigration 101, 102, 103
 Traveller, the, on God's path 59
 Treasury (*Bait-ul-Māl*) 124
 Tribes, the ten lost, of Israel 90, 91, 94
 Tribes, Criminal, in Panjab 126
 Trimūrti, the Hindu 101
 Trinity, the Christian 94, 95; of the Āryas, God, soul and matter 103
 Turkestan 93
 Turkey, the Turks 38, 49, 138 153

Two Hundred and Fifty-two Authentic Miracles of Muḥammad 39

UNITED PROVINCES, the 112

United States of America, *Crimes of Preachers* in 34; J. A. Dowie on Lake Michigan 45, references to, in *Review of Religions* 17; a religious liberal in 55

Union, between Āryas, Hindus and Aḥmadīs sought 104, 105; of Hinduism and Christianity in the Brāhma Samāj 105; of Hinduism and Islām in Nānak 106, 108; with God, how attained 60

Unity, of God 103, 106, 127; of religions 73

“Universal Brotherhood” 130

Universal Mission of Muḥammad 132; of Aḥmad 132

Universal religion of the future, Islām 135

Universal religion of the Qur’ān 109, 161

Universalism, of Bashīr-ud-Dīn, 122; of Bābism Bahā’ism and the Aḥmadiya movement 133, 135, 138

Universality of Vedas denied 111

University Hall, Lahore 24

Unknown Life of Christ, The, by Notovitch 92

Unrest in India 47, 113, *see* Disloyalty

Upanishads, the 102

Urdu language 89, 94, 103, 125, 126

Usmānī, Dr. Syed 120

VEDAS, The 101, 102, 103, 104, 105

Vedic Magazine, The 97, 102

Veil, the (*Pardah*) 67, 99

Vernacular periodicals, 17, 117, 120; *see* Periodicals

Vertigo, disease of Aḥmad 15

Viceroy of India 114

Victoria Institute of Great Britain 20

Virgin, Jesus born of 77, 82, 86, 127, *See* Mary

Viṣṇu 100

Visions, of Aḥmad’s greatness 15; of the future 142; of the dead, 63, 144

Vorlesungen über den Islām, by Goldziher 131, 134

WĀHHĀBITES 17, 46, 136
Wahy (major inspiration) 57

Wales, revival in 18

War, with Germany 136; with Russia 31

Wars, of Sikhs 13, 108; sign of Messiah’s advent 28, 89

West, God of East and 151; meeting of East and 155

Western, acceptance of Islām 135, 136; appreciation of Islām 129; art and science 134; civilization 68, 69, 75, 100, 137; critics of Qur’ān 121; education 65, 134; immorality 99; misrepresentation of Islām 126, 129; orientlists 133; scholarship 80

Western Awakening to Islām, A, by Lord Headley 129

Westminster Review, The 18

“What is Islām?” 129, 151ff

Wherry, E. M. 121

Whymant, A. N. J. 128

White, Rev. W. F. 119

Whitehouse, O. C. 27

“Who was the Founder of ‘Church Religion’ in the West” 130

Will, of Aḥmad 24, 112, 149; of all Aḥmadīs 124

Wilson, S. G. 138

Wives, of Aḥmad 114; of Joseph 127; of Bashīr-ud-Dīn 114; of Muḥammad 87, 142; influenced by husbands 150, 152; *see* Polygamy, Women

Woking (Surrey) Muslim Mis-

- sion in 125, 126, 127, 128, 138, 153
- Women, education of 117, 133; in Christianity and the West 99, 127; in Islām 66, 99, 127; in Islām in England 153; in Judaism 127; in Qādiān 115; in relation to Adam's fall 152; in relation to man 130, 152; to be veiled from man 67, 99, 146; *see* Polygamy, Wives
- Word, of God, the New Testament 79; from Allah, Jesus 77
- Worlds, the three 61, 63
- World's Missionary Conference 18
- “X” 23
- YAHYĀ (John) 82
Yahyā Siddyk 75
Yājūj (Gog), and Mājūj 31
- Yaqūb Beg, Mīrzā 13, 15, 22, 42, 160, 161
- Yasu 93
- Yisū 93
- Yogīs 108
- Young, Sir W. M. 72
- Young Men's Christian Association 160
- Yūs Āfat 92, 93
- Yūs Āsaf 92, 93
- ZAFAR 'Alī Khān, Nawāb 153
- Zaid 56
- Zakāt 57, 59, 124, 149
- Zainab 56
- Zamīndār 153
- Zeitschrift* of J. O. S. 27
- Zion City, U.S.A. 45, *see* Dowie J. A.
- Zionism 17
- Zoroaster 110
- Zoroastrianism 17, 64
- Zuhā, 'Id-uz 43
- Zwerner, S. M. 18, 39, 77, 121

PRINTED AT THE WESLEYAN MISSION PRESS
MYSORE CITY

